

THE
EVANGELICAL
QUARTERLY REVIEW.

NO. LXXXIV.

OCTOBER, 1870.

ARTICLE I.

THE CULTIVATION OF THE RELIGIOUS SENSIBILITY.

The Psalmist was a man who, more than any of his fellows, stands as the representative of the various phases of an enlarged Christian experience. His will had been brought into subjection to the Divine Law. His intellect had been expanded by glorious revelations of the Divine character. His sensibility was tenderly alive to every fact and truth of religion. His chequered life fitted him to sweep his hand across all the chords of human emotion. A shepherd boy watching at night the glowing stars, a soldier at twenty, a refugee hunted like a partridge on the mountains, a king at thirty, tarnishing the virtue of many years while on the throne, sowing in one day the seeds of a rank harvest of blood and bitterness, yet, out of his very errors, followed, as they were, by burning shame, prostrate humiliation and the penitential giving to the world some of the richest lessons and rarest fruits.

Irving has called this book one of the divinest books of all the Scriptures, the records of the most wonderful dispensations of God's providence to his Church, containing pathetic dirges, sung over her deepest calamities, jubilees over her mightiest deliverances, songs of sadness for her captivity, and songs of mirth for her prosperity, prophetic announcements of her increase to the end of time, and splendid anticipations of her ultimate glory.

There seems to be not a single aspect of his relations to God or man, or to the works of creation, providence and grace, which does not at once, and powerfully awaken, within the soul of the Psalmist, the appropriate emotion. To his pious soul, nature is the temple of the uncreated God. "The heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament sheweth his handiwork." When he remembers all the goodness of God, and the multitude of his tender mercies, he cries out: "O come, let us sing unto the Lord, let us make a joyful noise unto the God of our salvation." "Bless the Lord, O my soul, and all that is within me bless his holy name." When he thinks of the beauty of the supreme mind, of the infinite fulness there for the supply of all his wants, of the joys of worshiping so great and glorious a being, his bosom burns with love and strong desire. "How amiable are thy tabernacles, O Lord of hosts. My soul longeth, yea, even fainteth for the courts of the Lord: my heart and my flesh crieth out for the living God." The happy condition of the righteous in having Jehovah for their friend, and immortal happiness for their portion, compels him to exclaim: "Let the righteous be glad! Let them rejoice before God, yea, let them exceedingly rejoice!" When he beholds the multitude of the wicked transgressing God's law, and pressing on to eternal death, his heart melts with tenderest compassion for them. "Rivers of water run down my eyes, because they keep not thy law." When he recalls his own deep sinfulness in the sight of ineffable purity, he pours forth his feelings of sorrow and humiliation in the mournful strains of that Psalm, to which all broken hearted penitents flee: "Have mercy upon me, O God, according to thy loving kindness."

No one can make himself familiar with these refreshing, abundant and beautiful outpourings of the Psalmist, without a deep conviction, that the religion of the writer was one of deep emotions. His religious affections were keenly

alive to all their appropriate objects, and powerfully moved by them.

In the discussion of the subject, the following three-fold division will meet all present purposes: I. *The place and importance of the religious emotions*; II. *Some objections to their cultivation*; III. *The Divine arrangement for their cultivation*.

It is the vice of some forms of thinking, to represent man as a being, who may be divided into several distinct departments, a being whose faculties may be dissevered from each other, and assigned to positions of diverse importance. Scripture and consciousness teach, that the soul is a unit, that its activity is one life; that it is the one rational soul that apprehends, feels and determines. It is an evil or false psychology that would dissever the human faculties from each other, determine their relative value, and thus lay a foundation for unduly exalting, or degrading them. From the very nature of the emotional element in man, you cannot eliminate the intellectual from it. You cannot separate the thinking, the feeling, and the willing by themselves, as departments that may stand alone, that are not dependent on each, or that possess, any one of them, an inferior importance. The soul is one peripient, feeling, and willing agent. From its individuality and unity it follows, that each one of the three great divisions, made by metaphysicians in the soul of man, possesses an importance commensurate with that of the soul itself. The emotional nature of man cannot be neglected and degraded, without deep and lasting injury to the intellectual — to the entire man. The intellect cannot be wisely developed, without a harmonious cultivation of the feelings. The intellect, the heart, and the will, are not distinct faculties to be separately educated, or neglected. If they are thrust into any independence of each other, or any antagonism with each other, or if either one of them is thrust down to a lower place, the whole soul feels the wrong. If one member suffer, all the members suffer with it. There must be perfect harmony between the feelings, the intellect, and the will. What is good for the one must be good for the rest. What is true to the intellect must be true to the feelings. The cultivation of the one enlarges and improves the other.

In that Divine operation, by which man is regenerated, the whole soul is the subject. The understanding is en-

lightened, the feelings are transformed, the will is subdued. The depravity which is to be eradicated adheres, inheres in each. The holiness, that is bestowed, moulds each. The truth, by which man is transformed, is not confined in its power to the intellect alone. It is intended to excite the emotions, to influence the will. Growth in grace, is not a growth in knowledge alone, but also a growth in holy emotions, and in true obedience. The cultivation of man, if it be normal, must be a cultivation of his whole nature. The education of the intellect, of the sensibility, and of the will, must proceed *pari passu*, with equal step. They who command a religion of the intellect alone, and they who command one of the feelings, wander equally wide from the true. It cannot be a pious act that underrates, or neglects any of those powers which are given by him, who made the soul in his own image. The religious emotions which are but blind, excited feelings, and not the product of well-apprehended and true doctrine, are no more an index of spiritual life, than the motions of a dead body under the action of galvanism, are of physical life. In like manner, the correct apprehension of doctrine by the intellect, while it is not embraced by the heart, has no more of true religion in it, than has the belief of a theory in astronomy, or a demonstration in mathematics. It is the tendency of mere pietism to undervalue the human intellect, for the sake of exalting the affections, and wakening the inward feelings to the standards of truth. But the true Christian life is nourished on truth. It grows and develops in proportion, as it apprehends and receives the truth. Christian life is neither a mere series of emotions, feelings and desires, nor of intellectual apprehensions and acts of the understanding. It embraces both these. It is essential that men should understand and believe the right things, and, that they should be adequately and appropriately moved by them. Ignorance is not the mother of true devotion. Truth is essential; right feeling is essential to human salvation. There can be none of the latter without an apprehension of the former. If the light within us is not co-ordinate with the light in the Scriptures, the religious feelings within will not take on those forms of repentance, faith, love, reverence, and gratitude, which enter into true religion. If, on the other hand, the emotions are not tenderly alive to the facts and truths of religion that are revealed to the intellect, and never powerfully

awakened by the sublime revelation of the divine character and of human destiny, then such a man's religion is vain, he is yet in his sins.

The relation, which the emotional element in our nature sustains to the truth that saves, is equally important with that sustained by the intellect, that apprehends the truth. In fact, spiritual truth is not discerned by the intellect alone. With the heart, man believeth unto salvation. There is no such thing as a purely intellectual cognition of a moral truth. It of necessity involves feeling in a greater or less degree. To separate the knowledge of spiritual truth from the feeling of it is impossible, to put them in collision with each other is contradictory.

The importance of the religious affections is evident, not only from the sphere they occupy in the nature of man, but from other considerations :

I. It is right and suitable that the strength of a man's emotions, in view of any object, should be in proportion to the importance of the object. We are so constituted, that our feelings will naturally be regulated by their law, unless some disturbing cause interfere with their healthy and legitimate action. We make a vast and a proper distinction between the emotions excited by worthy and by unworthy objects, the tears that are shed by the sentimental readers of fiction, and the tears that fall on the grave of youth and beauty.

In comparison with the concerns of the soul, with the magnitude of those eternal interests, which are at hazard in the case of every immortal being, all other interests are of no account whatever. If it is proper to feel deeply in view of mere worldly considerations, how fit it is that we should be moved by the things that take hold on eternity. If, at the announcement of temporal good fortune, the heart beats high, the pulse quickens, congratulations are offered, how suitable, when glad tidings of good things are announced from heaven, and the things are revealed which God hath prepared for them that love Him, that the soul should exult with joy unspeakable and full of glory.

If earthly benefactors demand emotions of lively gratitude, what raptures of thanksgiving should the redeemed feel toward Him, who gave himself to die for them! Those eminent servants of God, to whom He has granted the largest spiritual experience, and the most abundant revelation of his grace, have manifested a glowing enthusiasm, their

hearts have swelled with inexpressible rapture, their tongues have been loosened with a heavenly eloquence, a living spirit of goodness and beauty has pervaded their lives, and their writings. And who shall condemn them? Why should not he be joyful, and exult with a holy enthusiasm, into whose heart God has poured the life-tide of immortality, who has been permitted to enjoy foretastes of the happiness of the blessed, and has caught, in beatific vision, a glimpse of the splendors of the upper sanctuary. We pronounce him soulless and void of all sensibility, who can gaze upon a master-piece of art, or upon the grand aspect of some earthly scenery, without being stirred to deep emotion. Why should not he be filled with holy and irrepressible feeling, who by faith beholds the future inheritance of the saints—the goodly lands, whose fields stands dressed in living green—the city whose maker and builder is God, the house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens. If it be appropriate to read, with tearful eyes and quivering lips, some tale of temporal misfortune, to hear of the woes of war, the sorrows of ten thousands of families, what emotion can adequately meet the great demand, when we behold millions of immortal souls breaking away from all moral attractions, and hastening on to destruction and eternal death? There is no sphere of thought, of life, that makes a demand on us, for the deepest and strongest emotions of our being, at all to be compared to that where lie the great spiritual realities which concern the immortal welfare of our souls.

Strong religious emotions are highly important as safeguards against temptation. Dangers from temptation beset the paths of the saints while here below. No amount of temptation can indeed force a man to wear the yoke of sin. No child of God will ever be placed in a situation of trial, from which he will not be able to escape, if he avail himself of proffered grace and strength. But it is equally true that believers, even they who have enjoyed close fellowship with God, are in constant danger of yielding to sinful inclinations, and they may be placed in circumstances, where it may safely be predicted, that they will certainly yield. There is so great danger that even Christians will be overcome by temptation, that the Bible is filled with the most solemn warnings on the subject. We are told with fearful emphasis, that even the righteous are scarcely saved. We are taught to pray, "Lead us not

into temptation." No man can wisely trust to his own firmness and resolution, as sufficient safeguards. A wise and good man will rather fortify himself at every avenue, will withdraw from every influence to evil, and will open his heart to those agencies which will confirm him in a virtuous and holy life. Of all the methods to gain this, no one is more promising and effectual, when pursued in humble reliance on the blessing of God, than a studious cultivation of the holy affections. Temptations gain access to us through our emotional nature, through the feelings. No object, however alluring, is the least temptation to a man, unless it takes effect first upon his sensibility and induces there a state of feeling more or less inclined to it. It would evidently be impossible for the world, the flesh, and the devil, even by the most artful enticements, to tempt a man in the slightest degree, unless they shall be able to make some impression on the feelings, the desires, the sensitive nature first. Gold is a temptation to the miser, the intoxicating cup to the drunkard, posts of honor to the ambitious, because these objects produce within the tempted peculiar states of emotion, of desire, of thirsting for them. Sin is committed by the sinner, only because for the time being, a sinful course is pleasant and agreeable to him. He rolls sin as a sweet morsel under his tongue. Revenge becomes sweet. Vice allures. The most painful and consuming of the passions gratify him who yields to them. A course of sin and disobedience is more attractive to the heart of the sinner, than a course of holy obedience, therefore, he pursues it. The feelings are the avenues by which the three great tempters of man enter and take possession of him. The town of Mansoul is entered by the gates of the senses. How now shall their avenue and these gates be closed, and the soul be rendered inaccessible to evil influences?

We reply, by throwing open the sensibility to all good influences, and by the vigorous cultivation of all holy affections. As one develops a love for nature by dwelling upon her grand and beautiful scenery, and filling the soul with impressions from them, so let the mind be filled with the overflowing importance of divine things, let the awful and glorious character of God possess the thoughts, let all the sublime facts, that centre around the destiny of the soul, abide with us, and have their appropriate place and power; and the world will either lose its hold upon the

affections, or influence the feelings, so slightly, as not to disturb the harmony of Christian character. Gather all these great elements of spiritual power and bring them into the soul, let burning love for God be regulated by holy reverence, let glorious exultation over our Christian birth-right be attempered by a godly fear, let joyous confidence in the Redeemer, and a lively hope of salvation be chastened by a humble self-distrust, true penitence for sin, and a deep sense of our own unworthiness and weakness; let a holy jealousy for the honor of an insulted Saviour, be regulated by a melting pity, and pure self-denial for the sinner's salvation, let these, with all the other elements of power in the religious emotions take possession of the soul, establish their empire and throne there, and reign in their divinely appointed harmony, and they become a powerful safeguard against all the temptations of the world, the flesh, and the devil.

Strong religious emotions derive an importance from their bearing on our own personal and highest happiness. It is from no affectation, or mere sentiment of disgust with the world that men in all ages, both in prose and verse, have described this world as a vale of tears, and bewailed their lamentable condition in it. It is the language of inspiration. It is literally and bitterly true, that earth's highest pleasures are transient and unsatisfactory. The hopes of men are blasted in innumerable ways, and their hearts filled with sorrow. Disappointments environ us from the cradle to the grave. To this state of ours, God has precisely and beautifully adapted our religious affections, and given them great and permanent objects. By them, He opens perennial fountains of joy in the wilderness. He liftest the affections from low and unsatisfying things, and fastens them upon everlasting and unchangeable objects, that can never expose us to disappointment. These fill the soul with a strong and holy enthusiasm, lift it above the trials of earth, and cast down earthly objects to their real unimportance. They smooth the brow of care, they gladden the heart of the poor, they wipe away the tears of the mourner, they make light the rod of the oppressor, they abate the fires of martyrdom and pluck the sting from death. They enable the child of God to exclaim: "I reckon that the sufferings of this present time, are not worthy to be compared with the glory that shall be revealed in us." He whose religious emotions are dead, or

but seldom excited, by the grand facts of Redemption, misses the joys unspeakable of the Christian life.

Closely connected with this value of the religious affections stands another, their relation to our highest usefulness. The affections are the propelling power of the soul. Reason may guide its forces; but it is the heart that gives them momentum. Strong feeling is a necessary condition in order to bring all the faculties of mind and body into active and vigorous exercise. A holy sensibility is the spring of our greatest efficiency for good, the great mover and exciter of the soul to benevolent action and achievement. The cold heart is accompanied by a weak hand, and a feeble blow. Joy of heart is nerve; it is moving energy; it is what keeps the mind going cheerfully forward in adventure and effort, bears it up and on, without faintings or weariness, to a successful issue of its struggles and conflicts. In every department of human activity a warm enthusiasm is the measure of his success. Scarcely has there been a splendid achievement, a great triumph, or any noble and good thing done anywhere, but the heart did it. No man ever became a great poet, without the eye in a fine frenzy rolling, or a great orator, without a heart on fire with the importance of his theme, or a great painter or sculptor, without genuine enthusiasm for the fine arts. The sons of the muses, the toilets in deep investigations, artists, jurists, statesmen, generals have been successful, as they have felt enthusiasm in their work, and been hurried along by some mighty inner impulse, a genuine joy in their toil. It is this which makes the spirits of man erect, resolute, patient, hopeful, persevering, indefatigable. This braces all the nerves of the soul. No man especially ever accomplished great things for God, without strong and deep feeling. The field of religious effort is the least favorable of all, for a frozen state of the affections. Everything here depends upon a warm and glowing heart. The difference between him who engages in Christian labors under a mere sense of duty, and him who labors out of an exceeding love and joy, is the difference between the toil of a slave, and of a freeman. The former slavishly groans under an intolerable burden. His strongest emotions are those of dislike to the wearying round of duties. The latter has the stimulus of hope, the propelling power of joy and love, and is mighty through God. He has life, spirit, courage, efficiency. The former

droops and is despondent. All that he does and says, is distinguished by one characteristic, and that is feebleness. His powers of body and mind, his thoughts, his prayers, his exhortations, his labors, seem smitten with paralysis. Half-heartedness palsies every effort. He halts in every performance. His soul is weak and irresolute, and where energy and decision are most requisite, he fears, doubts and hesitates. He is not the man for great emergencies. He will fail in the time of trial. The mere sense of duty is not enough. He is not the man for a contest, which requires quick and dexterous blows from a strong hand. The enemy laugh when they hear the feeble voice of such a soldier of the Cross, amid the din of battle.

In striking contrast to this one, behold him who overflows with holy and powerful emotions. His mind is bright and alert. Action is easy. He runs and is not weary, he walks and faints not. He has his faculties at command, can use them with facility, and with intensity of application. Every power he possesses is stimulated and strengthened by the feeling heart. His thoughts flow quicker, perception becomes acute, the judgment is enlarged, the memory is sharpened, the will moves freely, gladly, strongly, putting forth its highest energies. How often has a sudden awakening of the religious emotions clothed one, whose powers of mind have been regarded as very ordinary, with a surprising energy and efficiency. The Psalmist has sung the praises of holy joy. And if the joy of home lightens the heavy feet of the traveler, and the joy of harvest sweetens the toil of the husbandman, and the joy of beauty animates the sculptor, the painter, and the poet, how much more shall the joy of truth, and the joy of the Lord, wing the feet of the saints and send a spirit of triumphing into the hearts of all his people!

Without highly cultivated religious emotions, no Christian laborer will be able to act with the vigor and efficiency, that would otherwise characterize him. This will be especially manifest, when we take into view a series of years. By mere strength of will a man may, with some degree of vigor, devote himself to a course of Christian labor. But he will eventually lose his energy of purpose, and relax his efforts. The heart must sustain the will on its tides of feeling. These are fatiguing and exhausting toils in the Master's vineyard, in pursuing which the

Christian toiler will need the refreshing and invigorating power of holy affections. God has graciously provided for fainting laborers, bending under the burden and heat of the day, oppressed with the immense work that is to be done in saving the race, a high and holy refreshment. When the spirit and flesh grow faint, and the heart sickens with toil, and persecution and disappointment, and the tired soldier turns aside to rest, or to die, then God pours into the soul the sweet consolations of the Gospel, and refreshes it with holy emotions. Love, and joy, and hope once again animate the heart, fill it with enthusiasm, and springing to his feet, he girds himself anew for the battle, and his courageous shout of assault rings along the line of the elect. There is no fact of science or history better established than this, that strong religious emotions exert a sustaining and invigorating influence upon one, who is engaged in severe Christian labors which can be derived from no other source. The thirsty, faint, and toil-worn traveler, in an African desert, is not more revived and strengthened, when he suddenly comes upon a spot adorned with flowers, fragrant with the scent of cooling waters and delicious fruits, than is the child of God, when in his weary pilgrimage, God eclipses for him the whole world of sense, by quickening his being, and exciting the deep sensibility of his being with the joys of pardon, and glimpses of glories invisible to the natural eye. Some zealous ministers of the Gospel have performed prodigies of labors, almost without parallel in the history of the race. A distinguished reviewer says of Whitefield, one of the most notable cases in point: "Never was a mortal man gifted with such incapacity of fatiguing and of being fatigued. If the time spent in traveling from place to place and some brief intervals of repose be subtracted, his whole life may be said to have been consumed in one continuous, or scarcely interrupted, sermon. Combine this with the fervor with which he spoke, the want of all aids to the voice in the fields, and the thoroughfares which he frequented, and the toil of becoming distinctly audible to thousands and tens of thousands, and considered merely as a physical phenomenon, the result is one of the most curious of all well-authenticated facts. When, in addition to this, we remember that Whitefield was not naturally endowed with a very strong physical frame, that he often preached several hours in succession, at the end of which,

he vomited large quantities of blood, or sank down insensible in fits, which made his friends weep and dread lest he should never speak again, we are astonished that his body should so long have endured such terrific labors." The mystery is solved, by a reference to his biography. We are told beyond almost any man that ever lived, his heart constantly overflowed with the most joyous Christian affections. Sometimes, when he had become so wearied with a powerful effort, that he could no longer stand without support, the singing of a single hymn, would fill his soul with such joy, and love, and melting tenderness, that he would feel his strength renewed within him, and with gushing tears, would walk forth on the platform, and commence preaching again. "This day," says he, in one of his letters, "Jesus has enabled me to preach seven times, twice at the Girls' Hospital, once in the Park, once at the Old People's Hospital, and afterwards, twice at a private house, notwithstanding, I am now as fresh as when I rose in the morning. They that wait upon the Lord shall renew their strength, they shall mount on wings as eagles." Thus, when Whitefield seemed about to be sinking into the grave, God was opening in his soul, fountains of holy emotion, waters of life, that flowed in healing and refreshing tides, over all the provinces of his being. His case, is but one of a multitude, that might be presented in illustration of the sustaining power of strong emotions, in the midst of severe and protracted religious efforts. It is the testimony of one of the most distinguished of modern preachers, that pulpit labors are never so exhausting, as when they become a cold and lifeless performance to lifeless auditors, and are never less wearisome, than in seasons of divine refreshing, when in amount they may be many times multiplied. The ministry are worn out, not in times of revivals, but in times of dearth and heartlessness.

The case of Whitefield illustrates another great value in the religious emotions, when deeply excited—their power to move others. Without highly cultivated Christian affections, the minister of the Word will fail to convince others. He will never be truly eloquent in the highest sense of the word. If the old canon of criticism be a true and just one, that he who would make others weep, must first weep himself, how powerless will fall upon the ear, the verbiage of stagnant emotions. A man's intellect may be strong, his knowledge extensive; he may

clearly and tersely state the most important of truths, his thoughts may be arranged with precision, and the chain of reasoning be connected by the shining links of resistless logic, and the whole be clothed with language of great beauty and finish, still if the fervor of a warm heart be not breathed into the whole, its cold glitter will produce far less true feeling than one earnest fire-tipt, living word, leaping warm from the most untutored lips. It is the heart that speaks to the heart. Soul answers to soul, emotion to emotion. Strange as was the bodily and mental energy of Whitefield, still stranger was the power he possessed of fascinating the attention of hearers, of every rank of life, and every variety of understanding. Not only were the loom and the plough, the forge, the collieries and the workshops deserted at his approach, but the spell was acknowledged by Hume and Franklin, by Pulteney, Bolingbroke and Chesterfield, by maids of honor, and lords of the bed chamber. Such indeed was its force, that when the scandal could be concealed behind a well-adjusted curtain, even mitred auditors would nod the head. "Neither English reserve, nor the theological discriminations of the Scotch, nor the stately self-possession of her aborigines, could resist the enchantment." We love earnestness and deep feeling for their own sake. It is a comfort in a world of mere polish, frivolity and common place, to catch the tremulous and moving tones of a thoroughly earnest man. We pause to listen to such a voice. We confess its power.

We might make any appeal to the Divine Word, and show how everywhere, the Scriptures insist upon holy affections, as one of the noblest elements of Christian character and power. The entire book of Psalms is but the outgushing of religious emotions, and its great object—its mission as an inspired book, seems to be, to create, in the breasts of the saints of all ages, the like religious feelings. If we glance at the history of the Church, if we look upon the line of prophets and apostles, and men who have been most eminent for their piety and zeal in the cause of the Redeemer, we shall find they were all distinguished for the strength of their religious affections. Angels, in their sublime flights of mercy and tireless benefaction, have no more to project and sustain them. The life of our blessed Lord constantly and beautifully illustrated the same state of a holy and powerful sensibility. He is represented as

grieved at the hardness of men's hearts, as filled with pity and compassion for the sinner, as sympathizing with every mourner, as being eaten up with zeal, as offering up prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears. God himself, is everywhere represented as a being of emotion, infinitely strong. He seems to delight in revealing himself to his creatures, by a constant reference to those holy affections, which are the glory of the divine character. The mighty arm of the divine power is girded, and the Son of his love is hastened down to the cross, because the yearnings of infinite compassion are stirred, and the ocean of God's benevolence heaves in pity for the mortal race.

We will answer briefly some popular objections to a Cultivation of the Religious Emotions. It is said by those who are opposed to any unusual manifestation of religious enthusiasm, that there is *no religion in mere feeling*. It will be readily granted, that the religious sensibility in some of its forms, is strongly excited, even in the impenitent. The great facts and truths of religion have such a thrilling interest, that constituted as we are, it is well-nigh impossible to contemplate them for any length of time without being deeply moved. Who has not seen the sinner filled with an awful dread of the anger of God, and a deep loathing of his own vileness? Who has not beheld him weep, as the loving kindness, the sufferings and death of the Redeemer were portrayed? Many a time, even to the persistent sinner, the divine character has been presented in a light so amiable, as to awaken in his bosom, something like a transitory affection. The beauty and grandeur of the great outlines of the Christian system, appeal powerfully to cultivated minds, and excite a kind of religious enthusiasm. Many, under the fervid appeals of Whitefield, or Massillon, has trembled with fear, melted into tenderness, swelled into rapturous love and praise in view of the majestic loveliness of God, without exercising one particle of genuine repentance, faith or love. Profanites, seared by sins, have glowed with something like praise, while listening to a sublime Oratorio of Handel. All classes of people, infidels as well as believers, the vilest and most frivolous devotees of fashion, as well as the most conscientious friends of religion, vied with each other in their enthusiasm, while listening to Dr. Chalmer's Discourse on Modern Astronomy.

Strong excitement on the subject of religion is perfectly

consistent with a sinful life. Among Christians also, the degree of religious emotion, is far from being a reliable test of the degree of advancement in piety. Some men are constitutionally cold and phlegmatic in temperament. Others are highly susceptible of deep feeling. The health often exerts a marked influence upon the state of the emotions. Some men restrain their feelings through fear of delusion and fanaticism. It is far from being certain, that he who feels most strongly, has therefore the largest Christian experience.

Granting thus much, we may still affirm, that deep feeling is a natural result of a holy life, and communion with truth, and that, other things being equal, he who enjoys closest fellowship with God, will be most strongly moved by the facts and truths of religion. We may also affirm, that while the presence of strong emotion is not always conclusive evidence of holiness, the entire absence of it is conclusive evidence of the want of holiness. It is impossible that a real Christian should not at times feel deeply. No matter what a man's natural temperament may be, nor what may have been his early training, if he has really been converted, if his eyes have been open to his guilt and danger, if he has really been led to accept God, as his Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ, as his Saviour, he has felt deeply. His soul has been dissolved in tenderness. Heaven, hell, immortality, Jesus, God! It is impossible for any man under that power of the Holy Spirit which regenerates, to so seriously dwell upon these topics, as to make them available for his salvation, without having the fountain in him broken up. A disciple of Jesus, without a tender heart; a disciple of Jesus, who never felt the glow of holy affections; a disciple of Jesus, who never bathed his precious feet with tears, and who never with his Saviour melted with pity over a lost race; a disciple of Jesus, who, when others are crying unto God night and day, for the salvation of souls, or who are triumphing over the ingathering of a great harvest, stands coldly and self-complacently apart, and tells, his religion is a religion of principle, and not a religion of feeling! As if there could be the one without the other; as if the mighty God would come into the soul of man, enlighten the intellect, subdue the will; transform the whole nature, planting his own image there, without kindling the affections! To such a disciple we would say: Instead of congratulating yourself

on the calm and philosophical character of your religion, instead of pluming yourself on their supposed superiority to others, who, in their weakness, are carried away by mere feelings, it would be wiser for you to tremble for the safety of your soul, wiser to press the searching question, whether you have really passed from death unto life, wiser to look anew, and with deepest seriousness, to the foundation on which you have built your extravagant hopes. There are many, especially in the higher walks of life, with whom a religion without emotion is much in fashion. With such, it is vulgar to feel deeply. There are, among men of intellectual character and pursuits, those, who deem themselves happy in having a piety, which is of a rational and dignified stamp, a piety free from all extravagance, and different from the ignorant and common classes of mankind. They attribute it to their superior intelligence, self-command, and elevation of mind. They feel no sympathy at the sight of an illiterate man, weeping aloud, as he thinks of the Saviour's love, or joyously pouring forth his rude and uncultivated songs of praise to God. "There is no religion in mere feeling." Certainly not, but there is much strong feeling in religion. There are sobs of sorrow and songs of joy, tears and smiles, valleys of humiliation, and enchanted lands, houses, beautiful arbors of rest, and mountains of vision along the Christian's path; and he who meets them not, is hardly in the way.

There is a class of persons, who go a step further and contend, that strong religious emotions are positively injurious. They point us to the history of fanatical religious movements. The Religious Sensibility is a mighty power, and when aroused, becomes unmanageable. It has been the cause of direst evils. The wild delusions which have rent the bosom of the Church, have originated here. The affections need to be zealously watched, vigorously suppressed, and kept aloof from all exciting causes. There is some truth, doubtless, in objections from this quarter. If the sensibility is set on fire, while the intellect is unenlightened, and the reason and the judgment are asleep, it will be strong in the elements of death; it will be like a war horse, without a rider, careering madly over the field of battle. No doubt Christians who are stimulated, without being instructed, will fall into a state of spiritual delirium and intoxication. Religious emotions may produce most disastrous results, for want of systematic develop-

ment. If those truths of the Divine Word, which are calculated to excite emotions of joy, hope, and confidence, be exclusively dwelt upon, or those which appeal to emotions of the opposite kind, fear, sorrow, self-distrust; in each case there will be a monstrous development of the sensibility. We may rise to a rash self-confidence, and an unsufferable pride, or fall into a paralyzing despondency, and be overwhelmed by despair. Our merciful heavenly Father has taken the greatest pains to save us from both these evils, and to secure a harmonious development of the affections. He has arrayed both classes of motives before us, and given them exceeding power. He has provided objects to occupy every power and capacity of our being, objects to excite a godly fear and self-distrust, objects to excite a holy confidence and courage. He has provided for the enlightening of the understanding, the warming of the heart, the activity of the will, equally and harmoniously. His Word contains both promises and terrors, precepts and entreaties, the glories of a world of light, the terror of his power. But if men will embrace one portion of its truths, and overlook the others, they cannot escape a dangerous bias of the emotions. They will live in despondency and morbid dread, under a sky perpetually overspread with clouds, through which the smile of a Father seldom or never breaks, or they will rush to the opposite extreme of self-confidence, boasting of their spiritual attainments, and speaking with utmost positiveness of their spiritual condition. These opposite emotional tendencies sometimes characterize whole denominations of Christians. The creed, the peculiarities of doctrine, the manner of presenting the truth, the exhortations and the general influence of one denomination may wear a sombre, severe and gloomy hue, while another will be exhilarating, joyous, hopeful; another still deprecating all excitement of feeling, and all religious enthusiasm, may be cold, formal and stately in character. The remedy in each case, is one and the same; an enlightening of the intellect with all the great truths of Revelation, a corresponding submission of the will, and giving to each truth that power over the emotions, that its importance demands.

We were to offer some hints upon the Cultivation of the Religious Affections, especially the Divine arrangements

for it. God has not created man with such capacities in his emotional nature, without providing objects that are completely adapted to fill and satisfy them. He opens to his friends, the sublime truths of religion. He has opened the fields of human science, alike for the exploration of his friends and his enemies. But He has reserved a princely domain, a royal field, from which He excludes all but his friends. Into the boundless region of spiritual truth He leads his child, giving him an eye to see, an ear to hear, and a heart to comprehend that which the natural man neither sees, nor hears, nor understands. He arches over him a heaven, set with suns and stars, besides whose magnificence these heavens that declare his glory pale into obscurity. Divine truths are the unsettling stars of that sky, and brighter and purer by far is their shining, than all the stars in this firmament, which is his handiwork. The Lord God is a Sun. As it is written: "Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, nor have entered into the heart of man, the things which God has prepared for them that love him." But God has revealed them unto us. How boundless the vast system of knowledge, into which God introduces us, how moving and powerful their truths. If we look at but man alone, apparently so insignificant, he grows into stately proportions, when we remember his destiny. If we turn to Providence, to the earthly fortunes, to the eternal destinies of the Church, to the wonders of redemption, to the yet concealed mysteries of angelic history, to the revelations already given of him, who was the Godhead bodily, and beyond these all, turn to think and learn of him who filleth all in all, O, what sublime preparations God hath made for enlarging and filling the sanctified emotions of man! He has not only provided pure, grand and everlasting objects, to excite the affections, but He himself comes to us, to bring these objects in their sanctifying power to our hearts. The Father of our spirits knoweth perfectly our frame. He knows how to touch every chord of the soul, and tune it into harmony with whatever is beautiful and good. He knows how to awaken all holy emotions, and fill the soul with joy unspeakable and full of glory. By his omnipotent Spirit, He can pour upon the intellect such overwhelming views of his own character, and such a sense of his excellence upon the heart, as shall break asunder the chains of sin, wean the affections from the world, and fill them with heavenly purity and

power. To many Christians, indeed, the doctrine of the spirit may be practically little better than a beautiful theory. It was better than this to the apostles. It was more than this to the early Christians, who carried the Gospel to the ends of the earth. It was something better than this to the holy martyrs when burning at the stake. It has been something better than this in every age, to all those eminent servants of God, who have made greatest progress in the spiritual life. Let us repeat again, that early and true word of the Church: "I believe in the Holy Ghost." Let us meet the world with it, and saints as lovely as any that are written in Scripture, preachers as a power to set forth Christ, as any whose names illuminate the records of the Church, Christians as full of zeal and spiritual power, will rise up to fill all the ways of Zion with gladness.

He who would bring his affections to their proper relations to the truths of the Gospel, must intelligently and perseveringly coöperate with the Holy Spirit in this noble work. He must keep the great facts and truths of religion before the intellect. He must ponder them, give them their place and power, bring his will in subjection to them, and seeking, in holy prayer, converse with infinite purity, every holy and noble affection will be developed in true power and symmetry. We greatly need a baptism of the affections. It is indispensable to any great spiritual achievements. Holy emotions speed the angels. Infinite affections possess the divine nature. Let but the Spirit of God be poured generally and powerfully upon the hearts of his people, till the will moves gladly and swiftly in obedience, and the intellect is bathed in sublime and precious truths, and the whole sensibility glows with love, and pants with holy desire, and is filled with that joy, which God himself describes, as unspeakable and full of joy, and who can estimate the amount of spiritual power the Church would bring to bear upon the world? The prisoners in the dungeons of sin would hear the songs of God's happy people, and long to break their chains. Sorrow, and despondency, and spiritual gloom, the enfeebling foes of the Church, would vanish as spectres of the night. The mountain of the Lord's house, would stand upon the tops of the mountains; every battlement and pinnacle be illuminated with an irresistible joy, and a lustre outshining the sun. The darkened and sorrowing nations would

see it from the remotest ends of the earth, and would flee unto it. We need more than firm conviction, more than a perfect orthodoxy, more than an educated ministry, and well instructed Church. We need the subduing, enlivening, controlling power of the Holy Spirit in our hearts, enfeebled, darkened and sick, by reason of our sin. Let him establish there, the immutable empire of holy affections, love, joy, peace, and their glorious attendants, and the Church will be filled with characters, that are the noblest possible on earth, and the glory and delight of Heaven.

ARTICLE II.

AIDS TO SERMONIZING. TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN OF DR. A. ROGGE.

By Rev. A. R. Rude, Columbia, S. C.

Preaching cometh by the Word of God, but it is not at all indifferent how it comes. The sermon may pour down like rain and snow from the sky, or fall feebly like the slender stream from a water-pot. Water is taken from the fountain in the hollow of the hand to quench thirst, but powerful machines are employed, when great effects are to be produced. There are mighty powers in the water of life, which is the Word of God, for the Gospel is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth. But preaching is appointed to communicate this power of God to the hearts, and to work faith in all, who hear the Word preached. Grand problems can only be solved by the employment of grand means and great efforts, and much labor beside.

I hold, that the homiletic material, which we now possess, is the principal means by which the treasures of the Divine Word are to be made available in preaching. A preacher must study sermons, and such study should also bring forth fruit. He must employ, consciously or not, that which he reads. We are all agreed on this point; it

is, therefore, not necessary to discuss it. But we agree, when we define the theme given us, and ask : *Is a preacher permitted to use homiletic aids in preparing his sermons ? How, and to what extent may he make use of them ?*

Let us suppose we are at church. We hear a sermon, which evidently edifies the congregation, it has also made a deep impression on us. But, unfortunately, a well-read individual who was present, remarks in our hearing: "The sermon was good, but it was one of Ahlfeld's." This observation lessens undeniably the impression made. A preacher, therefore, must not be a plagiarist.

Let us next transfer ourselves to a ministerial colloquium. The text for the approaching Sunday is discussed. Some one proposes to read a sermon on it, when a brother objects, saying: "Do not read, you banish my ideas." I believe it would be both suitable and just to answer: "A preacher has no business to aspire after originality."

Practice points out the wrong course, but only the Word of God gives us the true answer to the questions proposed. It is not necessary that I state, that I do not intend to place the holy men of God, whose speeches are contained in the Bible, on a level with even the most gifted preachers of our own time. Neither do I unconditionally deny the proposition of Stier, in his *Keryosik* :* "There is a great chain, a holy order of God's witnesses and interpreters on earth from Enoch, Noah, and Abraham, to Peter, John, Paul, and from them on to Luther, and down to every preacher of God's Word, at the present day." I think this chain not single, but double. The witnesses in the Word form the upper links, the witnesses in the Church, the lower. The latter must continually look up to the former. The ways of God in the Word and in the Church are analogous. It is not at all difficult to prove, that the preachers presented to us in the Scriptures, among other things, qualified themselves for the office of preaching, by availing themselves of the labors of their predecessors. The spirit of Moses rests upon the Seventy Elders of Israel. Samuel's school of the prophets preserves, increases, and transmits the existing homiletic material. Its scholars labor together, and improve themselves by mutual intercourse. The Word, which they proclaim *extempore*, awakens not only in themselves, but also in Saul, the gift

* §24

of preaching. The spirit of Elijah is inherited by Elisha. Nitzsch, is therefore right, when he says: "Prophets have imitated prophets, apostles have imitated apostles. The one has kindled the sparks in the soul of the other."

It may be interesting and instructive to illustrate this view by a few examples. Habakkuk, is one of the most original of all the prophets. He rushes in his grand address like a whirlwind, onward to the heart of God. He places so vividly before us the scenes he describes, that it does not at first enter into our minds, to trace the elements of his address. Like a torrent from out of the overflowing heart, rolls the deep, turbulent stream before our amazed sight. At his cry of woe, the desolation of his people passes by us, in terror-inspiring images, and we hear the thunder of the voice of God. At his call, the horses of the Chaldeans flit past, with spirit-like swiftness. The echo of their hoof-falls has hardly died out in our deeply excited hearts, before the prophet paints other and more impressive pictures of the rejoicings of the victorious enemy, and the misery of his people. He next carries us to a deep sea. The Chaldeans, the pitiless fishers of men are there, they take up all of them with the angle, catch them in their net, gather them in their drag, they rejoice over it, and are glad. Again soars, as on eagles' wings, the prophet's speech; it conveys us irresistibly to a high watch tower. The prophet and his every word form pictures in our minds. A noisy carnival carouses beneath our feet, the giddy revellers quaff to intoxication the giddy cup of pride, they reel, they are about to fall, and the flames of hell leap forth. A new vision appears; unclean phantoms rise up suddenly, throw themselves on the Chaldeans, and bite and tear them. Again, it is a high rock, crowned with an eagle's nest, the tempest hurls it to the ground, shrieking woe to them that build their nest on high. The prophet then rebuilds the city before our eyes. Its stones are cemented with blood. We hear the stones and the timbers converse together. We are carried to Lebanon, whose cedars, cut down by the Chaldeans, proclaim the calamity of the land. The prophet closes the mighty oration, with a still mightier hymn. God in all his glory appears unto us. The prophet makes him approach from Teman and Paran. Pest-

* Pract. Theol. 298.

lence precedes Him. Consuming fire accompanies Him. The mountains are scattered, the hills bow, tents are prostrated, curtains tremble, the earth is rent, rivers of water overflow it, the heathen are threshed in anger, and the prophet rejoices because it is the Lord who threshes them in his strength.

This brief sketch probably suffices, to show the great natural gifts of this prophet. What great events are crowded together, in his four short chapters. No Dante can describe with greater plasticity; and the drastic eloquence of a Spurgeon dissolves before such fulness of spirit and of life, which, however, would hardly be tolerated in any pulpit in our day. Many, unquestionably, admire the originality of this prophet, whose fiery eloquence seems to burst from his soul's inmost depths; and yet, this very prophet has almost nothing that can be called his own. His *spiritus* was the wisdom from above; his *ingenium*, the untiring diligence with which he appropriated every word of God, spoken by human lips. There is scarcely a single verse found in Habakkuk, which does not re-echo words spoken before his day, wherefore those expounders, who thought that their task was only to analyze him, pronounced him a compiler, forgetting that everything becomes new which he utters. It does not destroy edification, that his address reminds us of the Psalter, that the current of his thoughts follow that of the tenth Psalm, that its form is patterned after Isaías, and that the figures and expressions are those of Moses and other prophets. The living faith of this prophet united the different parts of his address so completely together, that not a joint can be discovered.

Want of time, forbids giving additional examples. A Simeon, a John the Baptist, nay, our Lord himself, either quoted, or made in their addresses a more or less free use of the homiletic materials in the Old Testament. Exegesis has long ago shown, that Paul and Peter employ, in a striking manner, the same forms of expression, and there is scarcely a single preacher in the Word of God, who does not, at times, stand on the shoulders of his predecessors.

The hints found in the Divine Word correspond with these facts. It is self evident, that we must not look for a dry formula, for the composition of sermons in the Word of God; but, it contains general rules, which are applicable to this all-important department of our official and

spiritual life. The numerous admonitions, To hear, met with in the Scriptures, are especially addressed to us preachers. The admonition of St. James, 1:19: "Let every man be swift to hear, slow to speech," includes, among other things, also the homiletic rule: "*Open your own ears to your sermon, before you open your lips to preach it to others.*" He who hastily speaks from his text, without having heard much concerning it, will assuredly soon preach himself empty, and he who despises the sermons of others, will hardly obtain respect for his own. We ministers are unfortunately but rarely permitted to hear, in the house of God, sermons delivered by other ministers; our study must, therefore, be our Church, and our temple. Our homiletic studies should, however, also be ascetic. This excludes, at once, the thoughtless and mechanical use of homiletic aids, we habituate ourselves unrestrainedly to a regulated, edifying way of working, and are also directed, as a necessary consequence, to the proper aids. The best homiletic aids are undoubtedly those from which we ourselves derive benefits, which lead us to repentance, and which strengthen our faith. Homiletic sketch-books, pulpit themes, hints for sermonizing, verses of hymns and illustrations, should by no means be rejected; used prudently, they may be of great assistance to beginners, but, it is an established fact, that they must be used with a correct tact, and must never become an easy-chair for indolence, for this makes them perfect abominations. Neither will any one who uses such aids, as Jean Paul used his famous common-place book, be exempt from the enormities of Jean Paul, even if he possesses his geniality. Such collections would be more commendable, if they did not lighten the labor of preparation for the pulpit; but made it difficult, and led to closer and more thorough study. The older commentaries on the Bible, of Joachim Lange and Stark, and the later productions of Gerlach, and still more of J. P. Lange, as well as such collections of homiletic matter as Brandt's, further certainly, by their thoroughness, and devotion, if properly used. Nor would it be right for me not to mention an older work of this kind, the "*Analysis Evangeliorum Dominicalium*," by the well known Conradus Dieterius, Superintendent at Ulm, (1657). His celebrated Catechism has (1864) been reprinted; and it is desirable, that the same should be done, at least in an abbreviated form, with his larger work. The

study of such works for devotional purposes, is usually only a secondary consideration. Sermons from the same source are the most edifying, and their use is, therefore, also the most beneficial. But the selection is, owing to the immensity of our homiletic literature, exceedingly difficult, unless fixed rules are followed. One may, to be sure, apply to a book-seller, who generally is well supplied with homiletic works, but a correct and satisfactory guide is scarcely obtainable by such a course. Nor must it be left to mere chance; it must develop itself out of our special relations. It must be the growth of our office.

We preach the Gospel to established congregations. If we desire to edify them, we must also necessarily edify ourselves with them, and through them, for we can only impart to them the experience which we possess. In the pulpits which we erect in imagination, the same course must be pursued, which we have to follow in our real pulpits. We have, therefore, to watch Johnny and Peggy in the kitchen, in order to discover whether our preaching benefits them or not. Our congregations would be astonished, if on the festival of the dead we preached a sermon prepared for Whit-Sunday, no matter how excellent it was. They with justice demand, that we respect the seasons of the ecclesiastical year, which, on that account, ought to regulate our pulpit performances. He, who together with his congregation, proceeds from festival to festival, must feel it necessary to conform his private devotional exercises to them, and to study sermons explanatory of them. The selection of our text should, to some extent, depend on the state of our own heart, as well as on the character of our congregations.

As regards the former, the confessional relation of the preacher must always make itself felt. If the preacher has actually a Confession, then has he also among his volumes of sermons a confessor, before whom he searches himself, and by whom he submits to be instructed. Consistent church members attach themselves to their own pastor without, however, either despising or understanding other preachers. This is according to the Word of God. Paul commands Timothy, (2 Tim. 1:13): "Hold fast the form of sound words, which thou hast heard of me." (2 Tim. 2:1,): "What thou hast heard of me among many witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful men, who shall

be able to teach others also." He commands him, (2 Tim. 2 10,) : "Thou hast followed my doctrine." He demands, in the Epistle to Titus, that a bishop should hold fast to the sound doctrine, "as he has been taught." Nay, he insists that Timothy should always renew his remembrance of what he has learned : "But continue thou in the things which thou hast learned, and hast been assured of, knowing of whom thou hast learned them."

It is self-understood, that Paul did not intend by these admonitions, to make slavish copyists of his disciples. The thorough study of the Word of God should awaken and quicken the gifts of preaching, peculiar to each : (1 Tim. 4 : 14) "Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy, with the laying on of the hands of the presbytery," and (2 Tim. 1 : 16); "I put thee in remembrance, that thou stir up the gift of God, which is in thee, by the putting on of my hands."

The homiletic aids should fan the fire kindled by the Word. I know of no sermons so well adapted to this purpose, for us Lutheran preachers, as Lutheran sermons. They, therefore, should occupy the first place. He who copies them slavishly, must be dull indeed, but, so is also he, who is not richly benefited by their use. Luther conducts us, at one and the same time, over vast fields and into deep recesses.

His abundant quotations and illustrations awaken in us the desire to know the preachers he quotes. He leads us into the rich treasure-vaults of the ancient Church, and brings us, at the same time, into fellowship with his successors, the *Lutheri Redivivi*, and he impels us to the diligent study, and the faithful use of them. He who makes Luther his pattern, will of himself find the road that carries him back from Tauler to Chrysostom and Augustine, and forward to Arndt, Valerius, Herberger, H. Müller, A. H. Francke, G. H. Rieger, Fresenius, Brastberger, Forstman and Hofacker ; and he will not be apt to stray aside to Zollikofer, Röhr, Brettschneider, and kindred spirits of our own age. Luther's sermons are original, and, at the same time, both general and individual. His words strike a chord in any mind that possesses the gift of preaching ; every one, therefore, who desires to be truly a Lutheran preacher must, whenever he can, study Luther. It is self-evident, that the other Reformers have as great a claim on those who follow them, though it is universally conceded,

that not one among them, is Luther's equal in the gift of preaching.

The selection of homiletic aids, employed by us, depends not merely on our confessional position, but also on our individual endowments. This should especially control the force of later, and of foreign homiletic productions. He who entertains a correct estimate of his gift, will partly strengthen, partly enrich, and perfect it. The gift is strengthened by the use of kindred, enriched by the use of opposite, homiletic characters. An Ahlfeld derives strength from Müller and Herberger; he might enrich himself by the use of Bourdaloue and Steinmeier. The dry matter-of-fact Spener introduces Luther in his sermons, whenever and wherever he can, that he may enliven them, and enrich himself. While the confessional position demands the true one-sidedness, our individuality produces the true many-sidedness. The former imparts vitality, the latter removes the wild growth of mannerism from the trunk. All things are to be proved, only what is good is to be held fast.

But the state of the people, the congregation, to whom we preach the Word of God, is of paramount importance in the selection of homiletic aids. The sermons, which hitherto have edified the congregation, and which the people use for their private edification demand assuredly the closest examination on the part of the conscientious minister, provided that they are derived from the Divine Word. It is said that Henry Müller, in the beginning of his ministry, committed to memory, and that verbally, the sermons of Lütkemann, his predecessor, and the congregation did not look upon him as plagiarist, but rejoiced, that the sainted Lütkemann had returned, in the person of the new minister. This, of course, could only be recommended to a preacher with as great gifts, and as deep humility as Müller, whom the appropriation of the sermons of another undoubtedly cost greater labor and difficulty, than the preparation and committal of his own sermons would have done. It is not a normal rule. But it were to be wished, that every preacher could obtain possession of one or two of the annual courses of sermons, delivered by his predecessor. But, as this is rarely attainable, the library of the Church should be carefully examined. A noble collection of ancient sermon-books, or works of devotion, is still found in many places. In addition to valu-

able Biblical works, the earlier ascetic literature of the district, as well as the writings of Sarden, Masecovius, and others, who are valued here and there by the people, are treasured up. This is the homiletic material, which the clergy of the district made use of, and the devotional aids, which have been transmitted from fathers to sons for generations, down to the present. The old quartos and folios speak a familiar language in those vigorous forms of expression, which the people still make use of. Such works either display great and cumbrous erudition, as either the "*Copiosissima Expositio*," by Reinhard Backius, (1696), and are credible to their authors, or also Reinbeck's "Meditations on the Confession of Augsburg;" or accommodate themselves to their sexdecimo form, as Johann Kispling's "Heavenly Table-Talk," and exemplify brief lessons by striking facts, or they observe the *aurea mediocritas*, as in Lampert Gediken's "Evangelical Encouragements."

Volumes are constantly springing from them, which take root in every day life, and these are easily reunited, whenever they have been severed by a rationalistic predecessor. Chords which have reverberated in a congregation for sixty or seventy years, are easily made to resound, and move the hearts anew, whenever the Word of God is the key-note that causes them to vibrate anew. The preacher who, during the pause, has fed the congregation with his own wisdom is soon forgotten, and the aged man, who, many years ago, proclaimed the Word of God so ably, is gladly remembered in the new preacher. It is, indeed, a great compliment paid the preacher, when the quickened hearers say of him, he talks like the old Prayer-Book does. They rejoice when they find the truth, which the sermon impressed on their minds in the forenoon, verified in print in the afternoon. It is difficult to decide the mode, the manner, and also the extent to which we may venture to use the performances of others. Conscience and homiletic tact must settle these points. I remember, that I read long ago, that a minister preached, with good effect, Hofacker's sermons to his congregation; having first announced that he would do this. Harms maintains, that such a minister should turn lecturer, and read. I class this among the performances, which each man must answer before the tribunal of his own conscience, but must acknowledge, that I, for several reasons, cannot approve it. I do not love such experiments in the pulpit, and am

not willing to be represented even by Hofacker, when I preach to my own people. We are, moreover, not to preach Hofacker, but Christ, as He is mirrored in our own hearts. Another mode of using the performances of others, is by quotations. These must, under no circumstances, be introduced in a pompous manner. They are not to serve as proofs of our extensive reading, but as aids in devotion. If it is presumable, that the words quoted, are already familiar to our hearers, we can, without any further ado, incorporate them into our discourse ; but, if not, then honesty demands an appropriate announcement of the words borrowed. Paul quotes briefly the poets of the Athenians, and the prophets of the Cretans. Quotations are, in most cases, only capable of producing the wished-for effect, when brief and telling. Long quotations are apt only to occur, when there is a want of harmony between two homiletic minds. The long quotations from Luther in Spener's sermons are, very properly, in an article in Hengstenberg's *Evangelische Kirchenzeitung*, compared with the fat floating on soap. A different use is again and again made of Luther's sermons, in the popular Sermons on the Epistles, which have been published by the Christian Union of North Germany. Luther's train of thought, and now and then one of his sentences, are easily discerned in several of these sermons. It is as if Luther's face appeared here and there in the sermon, but the stream of words quickly hides it, only though to let it reappear in another place, to be again submerged suddenly. The elements of the address vary like the bronze of a beautiful statue, and heighten, by their sportive nuisances, the impression of the whole. Such observations direct us, I believe, into the smooth path, which we should follow in the use of homiletic aids. The greatest benefit will assuredly be derived from what has passed over into the *succum et sanguinem*, and, therefore, into our current of thoughts, and into our inmost life of faith, so that it is not like a haut or bas relief, a mere ornament or loose appendage, but being melted together in one mass, it makes our sermons a harmonious whole. Such an appropriation of the labors of others can, of course, only have a plastic effect on the preacher's mind and heart, and thus make his eloquence a grace. It may, at the outset, make the labor of the preacher very difficult. But it makes it by and by easy. He who every day allows a single sermon to exer-

cise its full force on him, both as regards his mind and his heart, and without first stopping to consider the homiletic use to be made of it, will not only be in the right mood on Friday or Saturday for preaching, but he will also view the text when exegetically examined with eyes unlike his, who, perhaps, only examines a dry commentary, in order to find out the literal sense. The text is quickened. The voices of those, who have discoursed on it to us during the week, sound now in harmonious agreement from out of it. The true witnesses of the Church pass in spirit through our study, we are impressed with the invisible fellowship of believers of all time, we work beneath the eyes of the superintendents of the invisible Church. We feel both humbled and encouraged, when they present their gifts to us. We indeed realize how far we are from being what they were, but we do not abandon fighting the same battle. In measuring ourselves by them, our individual gift is revealed to us. We seize in earnest meditation the words struggling in our souls. We are at first almost overwhelmed with the abundance of ore. We convey it either into the oratory, or the laboratory. There the slags, which time and locality, real personal power or weakness, have mixed with it, fall off little by little, the Divine Word separates itself from the human words, and enters as a quickening power into our souls. Every thought opens to us a complete vista of thoughts. They gather like rays in the focus of the text, and like a spark, leaps suddenly the leading idea forth, separates of itself in its natural divisions, and the sermon follows now swiftly, and then quietly within the firm banks of the text. God has given it to us, as he gives us our daily bread; we can receive it with thanksgivings, and apply to ourselves the words of the Apostles: "Not that we are sufficient of ourselves, to think anything as of ourselves; but our sufficiency is of God!"

If any man charges us with want of originality, on account of such a use of the homiletic labors of others, we can quietly endure the accusation, for our calling is not to aim at originality, but to edify our congregations. It is not at all uncommon to confound originality with tiresome one-sidedness, or with coarse and offensive individuality. Goethe once traced ingenuously in a well-known piece, the elements of his natural gifts, and finished with the inquiry:

"Where the elements cannot be separated from the complex, what of originality remains in the fellow?" The answer is contained in the question asked. Originality only exists where many elements are inseparately united into a complex. Our homiletic efforts are original, and we are always complete men, when our sermon is a complete edifice, which the Holy Spirit has constructed of many kinds of building-stone, and out of many kinds of building-stones composed a euphonious concord, the keynote of which, is the Word of God. I have hitherto treated of the indispensable use of homiletic aids; the theme given me demands, however, that I briefly touch on their allowable use.

We do not always, when we employ homiletic aids, follow the movings of the spirit; we, many a time, obey only necessity. We are often, amidst the urgent pressure of other engagements, called on to preach, and homiletic aids are then used very superficially. Even the highly gifted and talented Bourdaloue, as Büngener tells us, in his Novel, *The King and the Preacher*, once, when in great straits, had the concluding part of a very particular sermon, dictated him by Claude, the Reformed clergyman. I am of the opinion, that I give everything that can be said on this point, in the following proposition: What in such cases is done from idleness, God will judge; what is done from necessity, God will pardon. But the closer we follow the rule given for the correct use of homiletic aids, the fewer exceptions to it can necessity impose upon us, the less frequently will we be constrained to make the last mentioned, and under peculiar circumstances allowable, use of the homiletic labors of others.

ARTICLE III.

COMPLETENESS IN CHRIST.*

By M. VALENTINE, D. D., President of Pennsylvania College.

In the truth thus stated by St. Paul, we have a practi-

* Baccalaureate Discourse delivered, in the College Church, on the

cal answer to one of the great questions, to whose solution the most anxious efforts of the human mind have been, for ages, directed. Up from the depth of humanity the inquiry has ever forced itself upon the attention of men, "For what ultimate end have we been made?" "To what final purpose has our being been adjusted?" "Where, and how is our nature to find the true object, in which its design is perfectly realized and its mission made complete?" This, in some form or other, has been the question of ceaseless ethical and philosophical inquiry. Around its difficulties have moved the conflicts of most subtle and earnest thought. It engaged the attention of the Chaldean sages. It mingled in the meditations of the seers of Palestine. It enlisted the profoundest inquiry of the acute intellect of Greece and Rome. It has come down, with current of deepening interest, through the centuries of Christian discussion. Speculation is still holding its piercing gaze upon it, and pressing after an absolute conclusion. It is the old search after the supreme good, every day growing older, as its beginning recedes into a deeper past, translated now out of the forms of heathen thought into the measures of Gospel truth, and awaking an undiminished interest in each successive generation. This ceaseless research has not been fruitless. It has, among other things, matured conclusions which greatly help us to understand and appreciate the meaning and accuracy of the great truth before us. "Ye are complete in Him who is the Head of all principality and power."

MAN COMPLETE IN CHRIST,

is the subject with which we wish to engage your attention at this time. Amid the truths reached, and attainments secured, in your course of literary and scientific culture, this, it is felt, is the one that ought now to be set as the apple of gold in the frame-work of silver—the gem for which the others are but the casket. Or, like the head-stone of the structure, it should crown and compact it all.

Our aim is to exhibit the reality of this Completeness in Christ. For this purpose four distinct, yet closely related, points will suffice, and explain how, in Jesus Christ,

Lord's Day, preceding the Annual Commencement, June 26th, 1870, from the words: "Ye are complete in Him who is the Head of all principality and power." Col. 2 : 10.

the "true Light and Life," men come into the complete manhood of their nature, and a practical realization of all that has been sought in the anxious inquiry of the ages after the chief good, the *summum bonum*, of man.

I. *The first point is, that in Christ, the aim and direction of life are truly adjusted to man's supreme end.* Without such correlation to what may be its *final purpose*, our nature wants its first necessity towards completeness.

It is necessary here to fix upon at least some general answer to the great question: "What is man's chief end?" Though the solutions, to which this inquiry has been pressed, have greatly varied, it is probable, that each of the prominent theories must be regarded as presenting some element of the aggregate truth. Hardly any great thinker is wholly wrong. His error is but the partial grasping of the truth. The failure to reach such determinations, of the ultimate end and supreme good, as to end the controversy, has manifestly resulted from the mistaken effort to identify it with some one thing, in separation from, and exclusion of, all others. So, some teaching has declared it to be *happiness*; some, *virtue*. But that our being was not meant to look to either of these things alone, as its final end, is evident from the fact, that it cannot be satisfied with virtue without happiness, or with happiness except in virtue. The reason why these two theories have, despite their inadequacy, retained their tenacious hold of thinking minds is, that each has grasped some real truth, and our moral nature does, and must, recognize in both happiness and character an intrinsic good, which does belong to the very goal of our being. For several centuries, the Church has been widely familiar with the answer: "The chief end of man is to glorify God and enjoy Him forever." This answer is twofold, and unites, in the ultimate end, the glory of God and the happiness of men. Though these two elements may not be intended to be placed on the same level, the answer is an illustration of the felt necessity of not excluding subordinate elements from man's aggregate final end. It must be borne in mind, that man's nature and relations are complex and many-sided. Though his ultimate end may have unity, it must, like his nature, be the unity of glorious and inseparable blending of different elements. Though it is one, it is from the multiform unified in an aggregate issue towards

which his complex being is to move. The ages of speculative inquiry, leaving the point still unsettled, may show that it is not possible to determine which of these elements is *supreme* in such aggregate end. Nor is it necessary to do so. It is enough to discover the essential elements toward which our varied capacities and powers are to be carried forward in harmony. It is not happiness alone irrespective of character. It is not character, without including happiness. It is not the glory of God only, apart from the creature's character and blessedness. The ultimate end—and this is all that we need know on this point for the practical, divine philosophy of life—blends into harmonious unity, forever inseparable, both the glory of God, and the character and happiness of man, as light blends into the unity of pure white the seven-fold glories of the rainbow. See how life is adjusted in Christ to these elements.

1. *First, to Character.* This is synonymous with the perfection of our nature. Possibilities of high and worthy character constitute part of the talent, with which we are to occupy till the Master comes. Character touches into the very centre of all blessed being. Creation looked to this, in starting our nature in the mould of the Divine image and likeness. Fallen man is perpetually recalled to it, in the high imperatives of the moral faculty. He ever hears the behests of conscience to do nothing self-degrading, or inconsistent with the best possibilities of purity and excellence. Because man himself is greater than any finite good that he can appropriate, he is assured, that the perfection of his own nature, is not to be sacrificed to any of the means or modes of its activity. The whole scheme of redemption sets forth this end. In all its wondrous acts, agencies, and powers, it looks towards the recovery of our nature from the blight, perversion and anarchy of sin, to holiness and goodness. As if, by pointing where the eye of God has looked in the mighty remedial process, He would turn the eye of men to the true aim, an apostle declares, "This is the will of God, even your sanctification." All through the Scriptures, character is held up as one of the highest objects of human care. To its right formation and development, the most vigilant and earnest attention is called with ceaseless voice. As surely as the perfection of our nature is one of the grand elements in the end, to which God has, from the first, meant man to

move on and embrace in the goal of his being, so surely is it in Christ, and in Him alone, that this nature is reorganized, recovered from its perversion in sin, and re-adjusted to it. The expression, "in Christ," so common in the Word of God, is no empty phrase, but really states this mighty fact of essential readjustment. "The Head of all principality and power,"—He from whom the ranks of loftier orders of beings have received and hold the life which, in them, is developing into its appointed perfection and glory—can take our life up again, into living union with His own, and re-set its aims and forces in the line of holy character. "*In Christ*," as the branch in the vine, living "*in Christ*," walking "*in Christ*," "found" in Christ, dying in Christ, sleeping in Jesus,—all these are forms of indicating the origin and fact of an inner conversion in which the believer is turned again into real correspondence of life to the perfection of his nature. It is just this change, first, into a new relation, and then to the transcendent character in the future possibilities of a regenerated nature, that St. John refers to, in that sublime exclamation: "*Beloved, now are we the sons of God, but it doth not yet appear what we shall be, but we know that when He shall appear, we shall be like Him.*" That is the appointed goal for character.

2. *To Happiness*, as included in our ultimate end, the correlation is equally clear and precise. It is impossible, as it is unwise, not to admit the great truth wrapped up in the false ethical theory of utilitarianism. Though it is not true, that happiness alone is "our being's end and aim," it is, nevertheless, a grand good, inseparable from our intended ultimate end, as light is from the sun. God has himself turned the most longing and piercing gaze of our nature toward it. We cannot exclude belief, that man was made to be happy. His being began in unison with the song of the morning stars, when all the heavenly spheres were vocal with joy. In his abnormal condition of sin, he is not happy, and the deep sigh of his disappointed faculties is, "*Who will show us any good?*" Redemption recognizes, and looks toward this need in man's final design. Blessedness is to come to him, along with holiness, in his recovery to God. The Scriptures everywhere present the call to Christ, as a synonym of the call to happiness. In Him the soul is to find the root and flower of blessedness. It is the nature of the new life, born from above, to be

happy, as it is the nature of flowers to bloom, or stars to be bright. And, though this new life, on account of its imperfect development on earth, and unavoidable conflicts with evil within and around, does not yet bring to the Christian an unalloyed bliss, it has in it, as the gift of God, the beginning and direction of the complete happiness which belongs to the final purpose of his existence. Of this *new* man, and of nothing else is the statement of the old schoolmen true, "The will is borne toward happiness, not as will, but as nature."

3. So, too, as to the *glory of God*. In man's chief end, this is, probably, the noblest element. In its pure unselfishness, it seems to be of higher moral order than anything else. But how is man to glorify God? In what way can he fulfill this, in his humble relations to the infinite Jehovah? The answer, showing how one element of his end involves in it the others, must be, that it is to be by the highest possible perfection and blessedness of his nature, recast and unfolded in the Divine image. In man there is to be a reflex of the glory and joy of God. All the unsullied works of God reflect His glory. It shines out from earth and sky, from sea and field. Whatever his hand has touched mirrors forth the Divine perfections. The whole earth and radiant heavens are full of His glory. They proclaim it with ceaseless tongue. There is no speech, or language where their voice is not heard. The movement of the nature of man, as the crowning work of God, is to be brought into unison with this grand idea. From his high rational and moral powers is to shine the clearest reflection of the Divine excellence. Now it is alike the teaching of Scripture, and the testimony of Christian experience, that, in true union with Christ, man's nature is recovered, incipiently and potentially, into the mould of God's. It begins to reveal the Divine. In this incipient transformation into the likeness of Him, who is the brightness of the Father's glory, and the express image of his person, your nature is rightly correlated to the ultimate end of glorifying God. Having lived the life of Christ here, you can say, with Him, at last, "I have glorified Thee on the earth." And in the high future, where saints are made perfect in light, there will come from your ransomed and restored faculties, and their holy exercise, a radiant manifestation of the glory of God forever.

It is thus plain, that the perfection of our nature is both

an end and a means. As to our own being, it becomes one aspect of its final goal and supreme good. As to God it becomes an instrumental revelation of His glory. It might be thought, that since man's chief end is, by definition something ultimate, the exhibition of the perfection of our nature as a *means*, is proof of a mistake in including it as an element in that final end. But the inference is invalid. For the simple reason, among others, that this relation of means and end may be reversed. If the perfection of our nature be a means of glorifying God, it is equally true that the glorifying of God is a means of the highest perfection. So, too, if our happiness glorifies God, glorifying God is the very way to our own happiness. Each of these elements is ultimate, on different sides and relations of our complex being, and no one can be torn from the other in that final destiny to which the infinite love of our Maker and Redeemer would lift us.

In this correlation of our nature, therefore, to the glorifying of God, we may make the perfection of our powers in a development toward their greatest possible intensity, harmony and efficiency, a distinct and conscious end of life. Not, indeed, so as to concentrate attention on ourselves, irrespective of others, but in the harmony of our relations to them, and in the spirit of obedience to the will of God. While He works within, we are to "work out" this design of all the powers of renewing and transforming grace. We believe the language of Sir Wm. Hamilton strictly true, when he says: "It is manifest that man, in so far as he is a means for the glory of God, must be an end unto himself; for it is only in the accomplishment of his own perfection, that as a creature, he can manifest the glory of his Creator. Though, therefore, man, by relation to God be but a mean, *for that very reason*, in relation to all else, he is an end." The apparent paradox of means and end in one, ceases, when it is remembered that man stands in two-fold relation—to himself and to God—and the fulfilment of the one relation accomplishes the other, which has been harmonized with it. There is a coalescence of interest with duty. And, thus, in man's aims and activities, the self-regarding, and self-forgetting elements of character are rightly combined, and beautifully balanced, and like the planets, under the equipollent forces of the sky, he moves on in his true sphere to the ultimate purpose and blessedness of his immortal being.

It may remove doubt, and bring this point into clearer light, to recall how this changeable relation of means and end is imaged forth in the realm of nature. It is illustrated, wherever we look. The flower that blooms at your feet, is at once a means and an end—an end for its own nature, to which previous processes are all correlated, and a means to human enjoyment. The showers that water the hills are an end for the gathering clouds—a means for the quickening of life over the fields, and the production of fruits for man. The steady revolution of the planets in their orbits, is an end for the centrifugal and centripetal forces under which they are guided, but becomes a means for furnishing fitting abodes for the principalities and powers that may inhabit them. So, everywhere, in God's infinite plan, the relations of being look forward, and touch on each other in inconceivable and endless successions. So, when man reaches the perfection of this nature, as wrapped up in the ultimate end of life for himself, we know not how much beyond this, such excellence of his being may reach—how far beyond even the reflex glory of God, the exhibition may bear off in more transcendent relations and influences, among other beings, in the measureless system of the universe. For it seems to us, that it is in this relation, that the beautiful words of England's poet laureate have their highest and truest meaning:

"Our echoes roll from soul to soul,
And grow forever and forever."

II. A second phase of the truth before us is, that in Christ, *man attains to the unity and harmony of his own being*. In addition to adjustment to his right end, man needs an inner oneness and harmony. If in Christ, his disturbed relation to his ultimate purpose is restored, he must also find the true centre of his subjective powers, so that the onward movement may be internally harmonious.

No truth has been more deeply realized in the consciousness of all ages, than the want of unity and harmony among the human faculties and powers. Man's loss of his orbit about God has been attended by inner confusion and darkness. Not only are the different parts of life felt to be sundered from each other, childhood, youth, and manhood out of organic moral union, but the heart wants a central point, and the conscience, reason, affections, and will, are in anarchy, and often in mutual antagonism. They

fail to blend in the sweet concord of one being. They fail to unify life to one law, or move in the peace of one spirit. Oh what a cry has ever gone up to the heavens from our wretched nature, thus rent, and torn, and distracted in its own being! Out of this inner contradiction have come the many striking utterances, which we discover as the most wonderful crystals of truth on the surface of heathen literature. From Xenophon, we have the exclamation, that he felt as if two souls were lodged within him.* The thoughtful Plato, in one place, represents the soul as a chariot with charioteer, which is drawn by two horses of contrary spirit, in different directions,† and in another place, as having along with the divine, a beast within him, devastating the peace of inner life.‡ In the bitter perplexity of Seneca, we hear him pressing the inquiry, "What is it that draws us back from the point to which we would go, and drives us on to that which we would abandon."§ So, in the old Persian faith, taken up in the Gnostic and Manichaean speculations of early Church History, the supposition of a struggle between a good and evil god, is used to account for the thrusting into man, of these elements of tormenting strife. Everywhere and always has consciousness testified to this effect of sin, forcing itself as a deep inner disharmony and discord into the centre of man's life.

The question now is, How is this to be expelled, and our nature to come into rythm and harmony? All human expedients and philosophies, tested through the ages, have been ineffectual, and have, like Satan casting out Satan, only expelled one form of evil by another. Jesus, knowing truly what was in man, referred to the only possible remedy, when he said, "Ye must be born again." And we have this "in Christ." In the regeneration brought to our nature by and in the Son of Man,—a second birth for the moral powers, in which they come out of the slavery of sin, and into the light of God—the inward unity is again found, and the complex powers fall into harmony. "Christ in you," the very heart of your heart, and life of your life, brings to your disturbed nature the effectual word, "Peace, be still." It is the very promise of redemption, "to gather together into one, all things in Christ—all things within us,

* Cyropaed. 1 : 6. C. 1. § 41. † Plato, Phædrus, C. 54

‡ Plato, Rep. 1 : 9. Ch. 12. § Seneca Ep. 52.

as well as all things in heaven and earth. And the experience of thousands on thousands has certified, that in Him unity and peace have come into their being. Light has poured through their reason, the heart has been sprinkled from an evil conscience, the affections have moved to their true objects, the bondage to lusts and passions, has passed into a heavenly and self-consistent freedom. Yielding to the grace of God, man has been restored to dominion over himself, has received the sceptre cast away since the days of Eden. His life is possessed by one great purpose, which either subordinates or crushes out all variant purposes. His faculties have been reorganized to one law, that which was meant to be supreme actually ruling, and that which was intended to serve, serving, the charioteer charioting, and no longer dragged in the dust, at the heels of the horses. Yes, the want of an inward peacemaker has been met. The mighty magic of Christ's truth and Spirit does affect this glorious inner change. The broken harp is re-tuned. Its concord is better than the music of the spheres.

We must note, for a moment, the relation of this, to the elements of man's ultimate end, already discussed. This inner harmony is required for the perfection of our nature. It is demanded for happiness. It is needed to glorify God. Turned again toward the final goal, from which sin had deflected our life, with our faculties re-adjusted into mutual harmony, each and all trained under renewing grace, mutually set to a development into their best and most harmonious intensity, the whole "compacted by that which every joint supplieth," we have thus, in Christ, the chief and grand requisites to that completeness which belongs to man's supreme good. As with helm set, he moves on, in peace and conquering strength. The ship, with every sail set and filled, speeding its way over the subject waters to its haven, has no beauty comparable with that of the organized powers of man, so renewed as to act thus in harmony. And sublimer than the vessel's victorious conflict, when storm and sea oppose it, is the moral triumph secured by this compact strength, when his course must move on through temptations and hindrances.

III. The third thing showing this way of completeness—needing only a few words of explanation—is, that *in Christ, we are brought into right relation to our fellow-men.* Besides the evil wrought by sin within man, working out-

ward, it has disturbed his relations to others. Man's attitude to man is abnormal, and society is tortured in perpetual ferment and collision. "Whence come fightings and wars among you? Come they not hence, even of your lusts that war in your members?" A desire to correct the evil has originated all the schemes and expedients of social reorganization. It has ever been felt, that the confusion, wrong, and wretchedness, resulting from the encountering selfishness and passions of men, is not the only and best possible condition of society. Social science, however, is, by the constant failure of its expedients, made to confess, that no simple organization of the unharmonized units can be successful. But here appears the divine philosophy of the process, "in Christ." It begins by restoring each man to himself. Each one, having had cast out of him the disturbing control, falls at the same time into right and peaceful relation to his fellow-men. There is no other way to touch the disorders and miseries of the world with rectifying power. You are brought under the law of love. At this point we discover the significance of Christ's founding a kingdom—not of forced elements, after the manner of earthly organizations—but a fellowship of love and spiritual unity. "The kingdom of heaven is within you." It is organized about the person of Christ, and in subjection to His sovereignty. United to Christ, men are restored to each other. Sin is disintegrating, alienating, anarchic. The grace of redemption—the law of the new life—is organizing, and the divergences are annulled in Him, in whom there is neither Greek nor Jew, bond nor free—where Christ is all, and in all. Types of character naturally the most opposite, frames of mind apparently the most uncongenial, tendencies the most diverse, talents the most varied and unlike, have been drawn into loving sympathy at the foot of the Cross, and around this new point of fellowship have moved into blessed peace and power. Here the brotherhood of man becomes again a grand and holy reality.

IV. The fourth and last point in explanation of the truth before us—*In Christ, our nature and faculties attain the needed maturing force.* With this subjective readjustment, and our whole nature directed towards its true end, we need also a ripening force, which shall develop character into its best fruitage of power and blessedness.

"Be ye perfect," says Jesus. It is a perpetual question, whether this abstract precept can at all be translated into concrete realization—whether our utmost culture can carry forward our nature within even distant range of perfection. Whilst the fulness of the measure of perfect manhood has always stood out before men, as an aim to call them on, their constant disappointment has caused the precept to look as a sort of sublime irony to their inability. As man never is, but always to be, blessed, so this perfection has always eluded a conscious realization. No man has ever attained the standard, and presented the perfect life of the harmonized powers. Along with this experience, however, believers have ever realized, in accordance with the teaching of Scripture, that in the new life of grace in Christ, they attain the beginning and force of a perfect manhood. It is, not now actually, but yet potentially, the fulness of the measure of the perfect. It must be remembered that Christianity is, not only a set of rules for conduct, but a life—a life flowing to us from the infinite life of Christ. It has the *force* of a *perfect* life, and by its own law transforms more and more into the *perfection* of His own image. An old poet has said: "Nothing grows like love." In this, the new life is bathed and warmed. The regenerated life moves in the summer of the Divine love. It is summer within, and summer without the man. And though perfection is not attained in the present state, there *is* a process of grace ripening the soul for glory, beautifully illustrated in ten thousands of instances; and in that higher future will appear the *ripened* fruits, when that which is perfect is come, and that which is in part is done away. If it be, indeed, true, that our nature's perfection is forever a process of *becoming*, agoing on upon itself, and still ascending the infinite heights of glory, still, the *eternal maturing* is but the on-going of the life we now receive in Christ. "He that believeth *hath* everlasting life."

We here reach the true philosophy of spiritual growth. Men have been wont to look to this thing and that, for something to stimulate and mature their virtues. They have turned to various studies, toils, or self-mortifications. They have sought to ripen character for the skies, by the self-communion of quietism, the culture of monastic seclusion, or the drill and discipline of asceticism. They have applied multiform *stimuli* for the maturing of their nature into the fruits of goodness and joy. But usually the ex-

pedients have been of but partial and temporary effect, unfolding but a narrow line of advance, or securing but a temporary excitement. It is only the life and love of Christ in the heart, like the sap in the vine, that becomes a pervasive and perpetual force of maturing the nature and virtue of man. When the sunshine is on the hills, and the fertile force is in the soil, the harvests change to gold, and the fruits come to perfection on ten thousand trees. And it is when rooted and grounded in the divine life of grace, with the living currents, ceaseless forever, flowing through the soul, that there is a free and perpetual unfolding of all the character into its true and immortal bloom and glory.

Gather together, now, the items of the answer, which the text affords, to this great problem of life. As believers, your life is put again into true correspondence with its aggregate end. Your varied faculties and powers are adjusted to unity and harmony, and your relations in the great community of moral beings made to move into the music of peace and love. And surer and grander than the life-force which carries nature without you into its perfect flower and fruitage, the life of Him who is the infinite perfection, is maturing each and all of the powers of your restored nature to a divine ripeness and joy. Is there any element of good still wanting, and unprovided for? Is it not true, "Ye are complete in Him?"

There are, in the light of this truth, several practical conclusions, which we wish to lay with special emphasis on your memories and hearts:

1. *The sad condition of any one without living union with Christ.* If in Him you have everything, needed to rise to final blessedness and glory, without Him you lack everything which the sublime design and high necessities of your being demand. The very first essential is wanting. Life is not put in true correspondence with its final purpose. Moreover, the inner anarchy being unexpelled, your being is under the devastating power of subjective disorders, which preclude alike the peace of repose and the symmetry of strength. And there can be no true ripening of your nature into spiritual perfection. Under the dominant force of sin and corruption, it must move on only into intensified anarchy and wretchedness—far aside and away from the goal of a blessed immortality, into the realm where sink to ceaseless ruin the broken wrecks of misdirected life. We all know how many men there have

been, who, though finely endowed and educated, have, by being without Christ, never come into inward peace, or a controlling, regulative consciousness of their true end. As restless powers, they have been chafing, and chafed, along the way of life, till they have sunk out of sight. The brilliant endowments of a Shelley flash a troubled light, till like a star out of orbit, he disappears in gloom. The talented Kepler piloted science into the skies, but seems to have failed to soar up through saving faith in Christ, to the high purpose of his moral being, and was swallowed up in the anarchy in which his varied activities collided and his broken life dissolved. Lord Byron was gifted with shining powers, but never seeking in Christ his true end and inner peace, his life was all rent and torn and tortured in internal disharmony, till the self-wasting energies were wrecked in death. Humboldt, with noble mind and great knowledge, gave no sign of any vision of God and His Christ, and after a long career of mere science, his spiritual nature seemed reduced almost to a blank. So with thousands of others, of less fame. Oh, men may dream that their nature, in and of itself, will come into unity, repose, perfection, and glory, without the life of Christ, but the expected goal will be missed, and in their melancholy history they become

"Like ships that sailed for sunny isles,
But never came to shore."

The first appeal to every one of you, young men, must be, to be sure your life is put in true adjustment to its chief end, in union with the regenerating life of Christ. This is the one thing needful. Without it, though you should gain the whole world, your life must be a fearful and eternal failure. Dante places in his lowest hell those who, by discontent and repining amid blessings, profaned and darkened God's blessed sunshine. But that is nothing compared with the guilt and self-destruction, that must be wrought by profaning and wrecking the lofty possibilities of your redeemed nature, exhibiting your powers, at the end of life, not only as having been wrapped up in a napkin, or soiled in the dust, but bound hand and foot in the bondage of spiritual death.

2. *You see the relations and necessities of your own culture.* It is to be a life-culture in a double sense—a culture of your life, continued through all your life. You have just begun the education of your nature and powers. What-

ever else you do, this is to be the work of all your coming years. Never forget this. So many young men think they have already attained, and stop at the beginning. Instead of living in the inspiration which comes from a constant vision of the mark of the prize of their high calling, they are turned aside to carnal and temporary ends, the culture of their own powers is neglected, and they make very little of themselves in the end. Their own being as a reflex of the glory of God, and a fountain of inner blessedness, is forgotten in pursuit of the means and instruments of life and pleasure.

Present tendencies are to value culture, or education, only as it may be available for worldly acquisitions and results. It is a preparation for business, or professional success. This value is, indeed, real and legitimate. But it would lose its glory if this were all. Its relation and meaning are nobler. Its design must blend grandly in the object of God's great scheme of redemption—the scheme which reveals the very heart of the meaning of this world's history. We must get out of all the false system of materialistic utilitarianism. It makes men reverse means and ends. Instead of looking on the universe as a store-house of educational forces, and man himself as greater than anything that educates him, or which he uses,—instead of interpreting the whole arrangement of human life as a complex arrangement by which the powers of the soul may be unfolded to their noblest height, and carried forward to their final purpose, men turn these powers into mere servants of the material, drudges to means, immersed, frittered away, and buried in them, almost as in a grave. Oh, do not look upon temporal utility and material prosperity as the final object of culture. Do not mistake the poor precarious enjoyment thus obtained, as the chief end of man. As God gives contests to bring us to the joys of victory, so He has filled life with duties and activities, not that the soul may be dragged by them in the dust, but to be a source of self-invigoration and ascending power.

In this relation we must put the work of a profession. Professional success is not necessarily the success of life. Preparation for it may be but a process of narrow, though intensified accumulation, giving only mental gatherings. Its activities may be merely mechanical and routine. And perpetual instances show how the most striking success in it may coincide with a constant deterioration of character, a drying up of its inner fountains, as the external

means increase, a disappearance of all the lines of the divine image from the blurred mirror of the nature, until at the close of a life of the most brilliant professional success, the man is self-destroyed, with little left, that God can love, or men admire. Still greater is the number whose professional employment is made simply unfruitful. Even incumbents of the Gospel ministry may hold their professional work most sadly off from their own spiritual growth. The aim to glorify God in the salvation of those that hear, may be withdrawn from a proper glorifying of him, if not in the body, yet in the soul of those who preach. And there is the danger, which even an apostle seemed to fear, that after having preached unto others, the preacher himself may become a cast-away.

But though no one-sided, or partial development will answer to the proper perfection of your nature, the life of it all is found, and found only, in the pervasive power of the religious element. There is, indeed, a religiousness, which consists in mere ritual observances, or withdraws into the meditative exercises of monastic seclusion, which does not vitalize all the life with divine power, but becomes either practically useless, or contracted and narrow. It makes only a narrow bigot, and not a divine life. But that is spurious Christianity. True Christianity appropriates for culture, not only a small holy area of a man's time and nature, but the whole of it, and makes it all vital with its regulative, purifying, harmonizing, and fruitful force. He who neglects it, neglects the light and air of his spiritual being. He who excludes this spiritual power, or checks it, does for his entire nature, what the tree would do for itself, by shutting down the sap in which every bough, and branch, and leaf has growth and beauty. It is that in which all the faculties, speculative and practical, have their richest flower and fruit. Therefore, in all your life, young men, let your nature have the full quickening and maturing power of the piety which is rooted in the life of Christ. This, and this alone, will bring your nature to its perfection, open, and keep open, in it the fountains of happiness, and glorify God. Do you wish to reach the supreme good at last? You may not know specifically what it is, but you do know, that in union with Christ you will find it, and all things shall be made to work together toward it, and for it. Even the conflicts and sorrows, the labors and self-sacrifices, that may be in your career, as well as all the fair and happy things that

can find living root in regenerate humanity, come to bloom under the shadow of Christ. Let your spiritual nature and activities have full culture and development. The work that you have to do for God, and humanity, and yourself, is all harmonized to this result. Be faithful to it all, and that Saviour in whom alone, you can be made complete, will at last present you faultless before the throne of His glory with exceeding joy.

ARTICLE IV.

THE CIVILIZING INFLUENCES OF CHRISTIANITY UPON THE WORLD.*

By WILLIAM HAY, A. M., York, Pa.

The writings of the philosophers and schoolmen as well as the almost unanimous voice of observing persons teach us, that the object and aim of education are to elevate the individual in the scale of existence, to bring him nearer to a perfect man, to improve his condition in society, and to advance society in civilization. Assuming this to be so, it becomes, then, to all who are the friends of education, a question of grave moment and importance, how shall this object best be attained? Without venturing upon the discussion of this question in its many varied and interesting relations I shall confine myself to but one of its phases, and shall endeavor to illustrate, that the study of the Bible best educates the individual and advances society, and I shall try to show the civilizing influences of Christianity upon the world.

The strong tendency towards materialism and the growing disposition manifested by many of the most profound thinkers and polished scholars of the day to ignore the purifying and ennobling study of the sacred Scriptures render this subject peculiarly appropriate for consideration on an occasion like the present. The pride which is felt in purely intellectual development and scientific discovery is causing men to loose sight of the necessity of moral and religious culture. Books filled with false and rationalistic

*An Address, delivered, by appointment, before the Alumni of Pennsylvania College, June 29th, 1870, and published by request of the Association.

philosophy, sustained by the most ingenious sophistries and written in the most attractive arts of the rhetorician are pouring forth from the printing presses in almost countless numbers. Periodicals, which like the fabled birds of evil come shaking poison from their wings, find entrance to the hearth stones of half the families in the land, and sow the seeds of moral degradation and infidelity into the minds of old and young. Voices of eloquent and accomplished orators are raised against the divine authority of the Scriptures, and associations are formed for the avowed purpose of counteracting the influences of Christianity upon the people, and gigantic efforts are making to restrict and impede the progress of great moral truths.

If the aim of education has been properly stated the object can never be attained by purely intellectual culture. Expand the intellectual faculties to their utmost extent—force into the mind of a youth all the facts in the encyclopedia— instruct him in all the sciences ever dreamed of by Humboldt or Agassiz and teach him all the languages ever known to men and he will not necessarily be educated in the proper sense of the word. The accomplishments of a well stored mind and highly cultivated intellect may furnish a grace and charm to the possessor, but the demands of education are higher and nobler than this. By education men must be made better. By it their power to benefit themselves and their fellow men must be increased and civilization must be promoted. All education, which has not these ends in view, must be in vain. The object of education should be to elevate the individual and make him nearer a perfect man. In order to accomplish this, it is necessary to instill into his mind more correct ideas of right and wrong—to teach him more accurate notions of his duties and obligations to his God and his fellow-men.

The truth here asserted, is apparent from observation, It is affirmed by all the disciples of rationalism, from Plato, and Socrates, and Cicero, down to Buckle, and Darwin, and Auxley, and will not be disputed by the most enthusiastic adherent of the Radical Club, which assembles every Sunday in Horticultural Hall, in the city of Boston, for the purpose of convincing themselves, and others, that the wisdom for which they are indebted to the teachings of inspiration, might have been gained by unaided reason.

Men grow in goodness and advance towards perfection

just in proportion to the improvement of their ideas of duty and right. The mind of man, with wonderful facility, adapts itself to his creed, and a man's creed gives direction to his character and disposition. A man's principles are himself. Hence, the importance of a proper creed.

If, then, the design of education be to improve mankind, the most profitable teaching will be that which will enable the youth to form for himself wholesome systems of moral truths, and to adopt a correct creed. We could not, by prescribing a formula for his conduct, convert a depraved and vicious man, into an upright and virtuous citizen. No matter how wise the prescribed formula might be, it could not influence the life and conduct of the individual, unless his mind were impressed with the correctness of the requirements of the formula, and he saw that they corresponded with his belief and ideas of duty. Before a man can be influenced by any rule for the government of his conduct, he must feel that duty requires from him obedience to the rule.

In case we undertook to reform and elevate a savage, we would not with any reasonable hope of success, enact a code of laws for his government, and command him to obey these and be civil. An experiment of this mode of reclaiming him, would quickly demonstrate the futility of the undertaking. Fear of the consequences might restrain him from open infractions of, and force him to yield an unwilling obedience to, the requirements of the prescribed laws. But this could never effect a change in the individual. Remove the restraint, and the savage disposition would again appear in all its cruelty and ughness. The first step in the reforming process, would be to impress upon his mind moral truths and principles, which he could easily comprehend. When he has learned these, they will suggest to him rules, which will cause him to act rightly, and make him better; and according to the correctness of the principles taught him, and the strength of his conviction of their propriety, will be the correctness of his life.

A Pagan moralist and teacher more than two thousand years ago said: "That to live honorably, we must know in our hearts what is right," and in language more forcible than this, an inspired servant of the Host High tells us that, "As a man thinketh in his heart, so is he."

The youth in whom are inculcated false opinions of

right, duty and justice, will grow into a man whose conduct will be marked by wrong, wickedness and injustice. Teach a youth to cherish proper principles of duty and justice, reverence for sacred things and love to his fellow-men, and he will grow into a man, the uprightness of whose ways will illustrate the beauty and the power of the virtues taught him.

The Arab with fiendish pleasure perpetrates the most revolting cruelties upon his enemies, yet would not dare to injure one who had slept under his tent, and eaten of his salt. He acts thus, because he is taught to regard cruelty to enemies a virtue, and inhospitality a crime.

With the development of the moral, comes the expansion of the intellectual faculties. In fact, so dependent are the intellectual and moral faculties upon each other, that the development of the one involves the improvement of the other. The discussion of the reciprocal influences of the moral and intellectual faculties upon each other, I leave to the metaphysician. But I assert, without fear of successful contradiction, that the more highly an individual is educated—that is, the nearer he is to a perfect man, the more his moral nature is developed.

Seeing, then, the importance of forming correct ideas of right and wrong, and of entertaining a proper creed, the question will recur, How can such ideas best be acquired, and such a creed best be formed? The answer is, by the study of the Holy Scriptures. The Bible aims at the heart, and makes men better by elevating the motives to action. It seeks to instill into the mind principles and truths on which to base a correct system of belief. It then lays down simple and unmistakable precepts and examples for regulating the conduct under all circumstances and in every condition in life. The accordance of these precepts and examples with the principles and truths laid down in Holy Writ, is readily perceived by the individual, and he adopts them as proper to be obeyed and imitated. The Bible is a book which teaches the purest morality, and is filled with the narration of noble examples of conduct, worthy of our highest admiration and successful imitation. Of all the books written for the instruction of men in moral truths, none can compare with it. Of all philosophies devised for the enlightenment of the understanding in regard to right and duty, none can equal it. In its adaptation to the varied wants of men, the Bible stands

alone. Of all the great systems of morality laid down by sages and scholars, none can rival in simplicity and grandeur the precepts of Revelation. So confessedly true is this, that there can scarcely be found amongst the most violent opposers of the divine authority of the Scriptures one who will not acknowledge, that as a code of morality, as a work of literary merit, and as a book of historic usefulness, the Bible has no equal. Truly may it be said of this book, as was once exultingly said by the Bedouin Arab of the Koran: "Burn the libraries, for their value is in this book." But why need I attempt to eulogize the Bible? What tongue can adequately tell the value

"Of such a book? the author God himself,
The subject, God and man: salvation, life
And death—eternal life—eternal death—
Most wondrous book! Bright candle of the Lord!
Star of eternity! the only star
By which the bark of man could navigate
The sea of life and gain the coast of bliss securely."

The rationalist may here, however, interpose the objection, that although the morality of the Bible is unsurpassed, and its rules of conduct such as must command themselves to the approval of the thoughtful everywhere, yet there have been systems of morality, the inventions of men, which contained all the essential truths taught in the Bible, and that there is in it no great moral truth which had not been known to those who never heard of the Word of God, and who lived long before the New Testament was written. It may be objected, that many of the most beautiful passages and sublimest moral precepts are quotations from Pagan authors. From this, it is argued, that whilst Christianity is a most excellent system of morality, it cannot claim superiority over all other systems. One, of great reputation as an author and thinker, says, that "To do good to others, to sacrifice for their benefit your own wishes, to love your neighbor as yourself, to forgive your enemies, to restrain your passions, to love your parents, to respect those who are set over you, these, and a few others, are the sole essentials of morals; but they were known for thousands of years, and not one jot or tittle has been added to them by all the sermons, homilies, and text-books, which moralists and theologians have been able to produce."

Others quote a beautiful sentiment like this from Horace,

"It is sweet and honorable to die for one's country," like this from Cicero, "Virtue is its own reward," like this from Terence, "I am a man and I consider nothing of humanity foreign to me a man," like this from Seneca, "Nothing is closed from God," like this from Marcus Arrelius, "To weep, to groan, to complain is to rebel; to fear, to grieve, to be angry, is to be a deserter," and others of like character, and assert that there is nothing in Revelation which human reason could not have taught. But these, it should be remembered, were the sentiments of a few highly cultivated individuals, which exerted no influence over the masses of the people, and did not restrain their authors from gross crimes and debaucheries, the recital of which would be revolting to Christian ears. Nor did the precepts of morality taught, make men pure and better, or improve their condition. In their teachings, there was nothing that aimed at the hearts, or feelings of the individuals. The morality of the ancient Pagans, like that of the rationalists of the present day, urged the observance of moral laws from motives of selfishness, and taught that virtue is desirable only so far as it conduces to one's pleasure.

Cultivated as were the intellects, and great as were the mental powers of those who uttered sentiments such as quoted above, their authors in searching for a proper system of philosophy moved with a doubtful tread. They groped their way in darkness, and longed for some certain and fixed standard of truth and right. Human reason in its highest perfection moves in search of truth with uncertain steps. At every turn it finds in its way mysteries beyond its power of solution, or comprehension. All the philosophies of the heathen were systems of doubt and uncertainty. All the philosophers lamented the impossibility of arriving at truth. "Across the night of paganism," says the author of *Aids to Reflection*, "philosophy flitted on, like the lantern fly of the tropics, a light to itself and an ornament, but alas no more than an ornament of the surrounding darkness." The questions of the immortality of the soul, whether a God exists, whether virtue is preferable to vice, were beyond the powers of the wisest of Pagan philosophers to solve with satisfaction to themselves. And so would it be with the learned of to-day, had not the Almighty revealed His Word.

Man needs positive and well defined information as to duty and right, in order to form proper principles on which

to act. Reason cannot sufficiently supply this need. Observation and experience may teach many things, but the experience and observation of different individuals are vastly different. If every individual undertook to discover truth by paths struck out for himself, and to form his opinions from his own observation, the opinions and ideas of men would be as diverse as are the minds and tempers of the individuals.

Humanity demands an unusual teacher, a teacher that is infallible. The teacher must know more than the taught. Such a teacher must come, not authorized by man, but by God, to teach what is truth. Socrates, the great master of reasoners, felt the demand for such a teacher, and in his dialogues frequently expressed the opinion that it was necessary that one be sent from heaven, divinely commissioned to instruct men in their duties.

Since such a teacher has come from Heaven and made certain what before was clouded in gloomy uncertainty, and has taught the world truths which before only the few could know, and that imperfectly, the great doctrines of the souls immortality of men's relation to the Deity and their fellow-men, doctrines which for ages, had perplexed the minds of the most learned and astute, are familiar to the school boy, have become the truisms of every day life, and are the proverbs of the lowly and the great. And the wholesome effects of the knowledge of these truths upon the minds of the people none can estimate. The knowledge of men's responsibility to a Supreme Being, and of their accountability in a future existence for their actions in the present life, exert the most powerful influences over men to become better.

But it is objected, that the study of the Bible is not profitable for, but is a hindrance to, the expansion of the intellectual faculties, because its students are expected to accept as true many things which are beyond the power of reason to comprehend. The simple statement of this objection, it would seem, should suggest to every thoughtful person its futility, and the inconsistency of the one who advances the objection. Who does not constantly accept, on the faith of others, a thousand things as true, which he cannot prove? Who of us could demonstrate the truth of many of the simplest and most common principles of science, on which we every day act? Who of us can give an intelligent and satisfactory reason for one half of his opinions and beliefs?

In science it would seem to be absurd to say, that one who is engaged in searching for the mysteries of the physical world, should not accept the great truths which others than he taught to mankind. Who of us does not accept as beyond question certain laws, discovered and taught by such men as Linnaeus, Galileo, Newton and others? And what would be thought of the Naturalist who would decline to make use of the teachings of these great men, because he is unable fully to comprehend all that they taught? By tracing this objection to its legitimate consequences, we soon are led to what the logicians call the *reductio ad absurdum*. It has been wisely said by De Tocqueville, "That there is no philosopher of such great parts in the world, but that he believes many things on the faith of others, and supposes a great many more truths than he demonstrates."

It is true, that science is not the aim of the Bible. Its study, however, so expands and develops the intellect and enlightens the understanding, that its students readily take to scientific pursuits, and endeavor by learning the mysteries of the physical world to turn the elements to practical uses, and thereby to lessen the toils and increase the comforts of men. Strange as this assertion may at first appear, a little reflection and observation will make its truth apparent. The history of the world makes patent the fact, that in those countries, where the Bible is most widely circulated and most freely read, science has made its greatest progress, and civilization the most rapid strides.

Compare the countries in which the light of Christianity has been permitted to shine into the minds and hearts of the citizens, with the countries in which the darkness of heathenism covers the people, and determine in which countries has science made its greatest discoveries, and which countries exert the greatest influence in the world? Compare China, with its vast extent of territory, its unnumbered inhabitants, and its immense resources, with the comparatively small England, or the Turkish Empire with our own beloved country, and decide for yourselves the question, whether Christianity does not enlighten the individual, and advance society in civilization?

I may be pointed to France and told that in that country, science, art, and the culture of the intellect have advanced with wonderful rapidity, and that there, infidelity,

scepticism, and rationalism prevail. I answer, that the influences of Christianity have been for a long time, and are now operating upon the French people. It is true that the Bible in France is mostly in the keeping of the church authorities, and that the Church there does not permit the Word of God to have free course and be glorified. But men like Fenelon, Bossuet and Pascal, of former days, and Father Hyacinthe of latter days, have been impressing the citizens of that country, with the leavening truths of Revelation, which has done much to enlighten and elevate the nation. It is true that many patriotic people in France hate the Church, and bring themselves to believe that Christianity is the enemy of civil liberty. This is because the Church there is a politico-religious institution, which is not content alone with the authority given it by God, but which strives also for civil power. Hence, many statesmen there attack the Christians. They attack them, however, as their political opponents, rather than as their religious adversaries. They oppose the Christian religion more as the opinion of a party, than as an error of belief, and they reject the clergy, not because of their faith, but because they are the friends and allies of despotic power. The Church there, as has often been done in other lands, is perverted from its proper and legitimate sphere, so as to become the means, by which a tyrant is aided in holding on to power. Those who strive for the freedom of the people, therefore, in countries where the ecclesiastical power is made the instrument for subjugating the people, naturally oppose the Church. Hence Rochefort was acting in obedience to one of the most common instincts of human nature, when he wrote the letter to the citizens of Lyons, (which was but recently flashed through the waves of the Atlantic, and which so many good people read here with sorrow,) in which this influential leader in the movement for the liberty of the French people, announced, that he had enlisted the banner of the liberal party in his land, and said that the first thing that is necessary to be done in order to insure the success of the cause of the party, is to get rid of religion, the barrier to progress which leads to despotism and slavery! Had this man been living in a land where he could have seen the healthful influences of an open Bible, in raising a community from bondage to the highest freedom, he would have been the most ardent advocate for the dissemination of the truths of Christianity,

But the religion which he saw was that which was in the custody and keeping of clergy, who were committed to despotism and the policy of keeping the subjects in ignorance.

As the development of the moral faculties of the individual elevates him nearer to a perfect man, so it advances society in civilization. I am aware that there are those who, like Buckle, will argue against the claims of Christianity, that in the name of religion high crimes have been perpetrated upon individuals, and great injuries inflicted upon communities. They will point to the cruel wars and bloody crusades, undertaken by rulers to propagate the truths of the Bible, and will tell us that Christianity, in these instances, has neither had a tendency to elevate the individual, or to improve the condition of the States, affected by these wars. They will point to men of acknowledged piety, who whilst holding positions of influence and political power, in the name of Christianity, inflicted great wrongs upon nations and individuals. But admitting this to be so, nothing can be more illogical than to assert that this proves anything against the civilizing influences of the religion of the Bible. It is absurd to argue that those things are to be rejected, which in their abuse result in evil. None of the evils which, at any time, have been perpetrated in the name of Christianity, were sanctioned by its teachings. Persecutors on the score of religion have always been maddened bigots, or great hypocrites, and their zeal has often been lighted at the altar of worldly ambition. Many argue that intellectual culture alone is the cause of a nation's progress. It is true beyond all questioning, that the expansion and improvement of the mind are glorious objects for the success of which we should put forth our strongest efforts. Whatever can be done to increase the powers of the intellect, should be done. Whatever will put into the mind a new thought, or idea, will be a benefit to humanity, provided the thought or idea be a good one. But it is not intellectual development alone that makes a nation great and powerful, and the citizens virtuous and happy.

It is strange that men at this day should set up golden calves and fall down and worship them. Yet they do it, and seem to find in the goddesses of mental advancement and material improvement sufficient objects for their adoration. The wonderful discoveries that are making in

knowledge and learning of all kinds, are objects of men's highest admiration, and the fruitful themes for writers and speakers in every hamlet in the land. The great manufactories that are everywhere to be found, the unending miles of railroad, which reach to the remotest villages on the continent, and the proud ships which ride the mighty deep, and whiten with their sails every sea, are pointed to with pride and congratulation.

These, we are told, are the causes of national prosperity and power. Now great as are the discoveries in knowledge, and much as are the material improvements of the present day to be admired, they are only the evidences, and not the causes of, the prosperity and power of the State. A nation may possess all these evidences of national prosperity, and yet be weak and imbecile. If the people are not properly educated in regard to their obligations and duties as citizens, these, instead of being national advantages, may prove to be a nation's weakness. They may lead to such indulgences by the citizens, that the nation will fall an easy prey to the ambition of a demagogue, or the avarice of a rival power.

It is the moral development of the people—the instilling into their minds proper principles of conduct, that makes the nation great and powerful. Lord Bacon recognized with approbation the position here contended for, when he wrote: "Walled towns, storied arsenals and armies, goodly races of horses, chariots of war, elephants, ordnance, artillery and the like; all this is but a sheep in lion's skin, except the characters and dispositions of the people be brave and valiant." This position is also admitted by an able and well known writer in the familiar lines, "What constitutes a State?"

"Not high-raised battlement, or labored mound,
Thick wall, or moated gate :
Not cities proud, with spires and turrets crowned ;
Not bays and broad-armed ports,
Where, laughing at the storm, rich navies ride :
Not starred and spangled courts,
Where low-browed baseness wafts perfume to pride.
No:—men, high-minded men,
Men, who their duties know,
But know their rights, and knowing, dare maintain."

And one of greater wisdom than either Francis Bacon, or Sir William Jones, has declared, that "Righteousness exalteth a nation."

History is full of illustrations of the fact, that a nation may abound in all the evidences of material prosperity and greatness, and yet if the people are not righteous, it will decline in power, and probably perish entirely. Instance the history of the empire of Persia ; see how she grew in power and wealth, when her people cultivated the virtues of bravery, industry, and economy, and how weak she grew, when her people ceased to cultivate these virtues, and indulged in luxury and vice. See, for a period, whilst these virtues influenced the citizens, how she conquered her rival powers. And when her citizens indulged in luxury and vice, see her proudly marching out with her unnumbered hosts in splendor to fight the ambitious Greeks, and how easily she was subdued.

To advance a State in civilization and keep her advanced, it is necessary to properly cultivate the morals of the individuals. Ideas, and not governments, are the rulers, and public opinion gives direction to the affairs of the nation. When a backward step has been taken by the State, there have been false ideas and mistaken opinions infused into the minds of the people. If it happens that such false ideas and mistaken opinions are removed, the backward step will soon be retraced, and the country will advance in accordance with the advanced ideas entertained by the people. The correctness of public sentiment will always be a fair index of the position of the country in the grand march of civilization.

If it be true, then, that Christianity is the best and most powerful means of influencing the hearts and minds of the people, and the best and surest means of forming proper public sentiment, it follows, that in those countries, in which the teachings of Christianity most prevail, the ideas and opinions of the people must be most correct, and their condition must be most advanced in civilization. This, too, it may be remarked, is not merely a legitimate conclusion from our reasoning, but is a fact well authenticated by history.

It is argued by some, that the education of a people in morals, has little or nothing to do in advancing civilization—that civilization is dependent alone on the intellectual development of the citizens. But we cannot shut our

eyes to the unmistakable teaching of history, that in all nations in which civilization was the most perfect, the subjects were the most moral. Nor can we keep from view the great fact, that in the last few centuries, during which the truths of Revelation have influenced the minds and hearts of the people, and improved their moral opinions, society has advanced in a manner before undreamed of by the most enthusiastic reformers.

Notwithstanding the great efforts of philosophers, of sages, of lawgivers, of warriors and publicists, to build up society and make great commonwealths, civilization advanced with the pace of the snail, until the moral condition of the individual began to improve.

The contrast of the condition of society before and since the period in the world's history known as the Reformation, makes clear the fact, that for some cause society has improved much more rapidly since, than before that period. Then, why is it, that since the heroic Martin Luther stood up and, unappalled by the frowns and threats of kingly power, proclaimed to the world truths which unchained the glorious gospel of light and made the Bible the common property of mankind, the condition of society has improved more than it has done in all the centuries that had passed away before that time?

It will not do to attribute this sudden advance to the progress of intellectual development alone. The nature of man is the same to-day, as it was when the Almighty first breathed into his nostrils the breath of life. Men are not naturally more capable of intellectual culture since the period of the Reformation, than they were before. There must have been some great and powerful cause to produce so marked and wonderful a change in men, which took place since the Reformation. If intellectual development alone were the cause, why were not these great improvements noticed centuries before they were. There is no natural difference in the formation of the intellect of man. A child born of Pagan or savage parents, is endowed with the same faculties as one born of enlightened or Christian parents. The difference between individuals is owing to education, and education is the result of external circumstances. A man born five hundred years ago would have entertained the same opinions, now indulged in by mankind, had he been reared amid the same circumstances that now surround men. A man is necessarily taught by

his parents and teachers his doctrines of rights and duties, and from these doctrines his character as an individual is formed. The importance to the State then of the citizens' acquiring correct doctrines, will recur to the mind of every one; for unless these be correct, the increase of the power of the intellect will be an injury, rather than a benefit to the community. Because increase of knowledge brings increase of power, the increase of the power of the vicious must prove an injury rather than a benefit to the community. The State has often suffered more from intelligent and crafty, than from ignorant and vicious men. Ignorance and vice, it is true, are often found to go hand in hand, but the ignorant are easily restrained, whilst the intelligent and corrupt man is an almost uncontrollable power for evil.

I may be answered, that during the present and last three centuries knowledge has increased, and men have learned how to frame more wholesome laws for the government of society and the protection of the rights of the citizen—that this is the cause of the sudden elevation of the individual and progress of civilization. But I am not prepared to admit the truth, which in this postulate must be assumed.

Whilst I admit the superior enlightenment and more wide-spread intelligence of men of modern times, I am not prepared to concede, that in purely intellectual acquirements and mental powers, men of these days are superior to those of former days.

I turn to history's classic pages, and I find in the record of the proud nations of antiquity that live no more, the names of men, whose genius and powers of mind rendered them the pride and wonder of the race. I find there exist human philosophies as perfect as human reason could devise. I read of republics, whose laws are to-day the models of the best systems of legislation, and the maxims of the purest equity. I see accounts of heroic deeds of patriotism, and beautiful illustrations of love of country. I learn of poets and historians, whose songs and stories are to-day the delight of all who are the admirers of poetic talent and historic art. And, when I consider such facts as these, I regard as problematical the assertion, that men of modern days are intellectually superior to those of ancient days.

And whilst we make our appeal to the history of these

nations that once flourished in triumph, but are no more, let us inquire why they have fallen? Why did they live for periods in power and grandeur, and then sink into degradation and slavery? It was not for want of wisdom in their laws, for the laws of many of those nations are now admitted to have been the wisest ever devised by men. It could not have been from physical causes, for the same physical causes that operated upon these nations whilst they were great, were operating when they died. It must have been some cause operating upon the citizens, that caused the nations to decline more rapidly than they grew in greatness. The cause could be found in the character of the citizens. There was a want of proper moral training of the individuals, which alone could have fitted them for citizenship in great and free commonwealths. The people were not influenced by the power of great moral ideas, which are so essential to the safety and welfare of the State, and from this cause, the nations perished.

Perhaps, I can best illustrate the idea here intended to be conveyed, by a reference to our own beloved, and I hope forever re-united republic. It must be conceded that ours is a most glorious country, and our citizens most wonderful people—that in everything that makes a nation great, ours stands unequalled by any on the globe—that in all the qualities that go to make good citizens, ours are not surpassed by those of any nation on which the light of heaven falls. And yet, it will not do to say, that all this is owing to the superior mental powers of our people. There are countries in the world which are far less important members of the family of nations than ours, whose citizens would not yield to us the palm for superior vigor of intellect. It will not be sufficient to say that the greatness of America is the result of physical causes. It will not do to say, that our great rivers and mountains, our harbors and seas, our mineral wealth, our soil and climate, are the causes of all this. Many countries in South America might rival us in the magnitude of our rivers, in the security of our harbors, in the breadth of our seas, in the richness of our mineral resources, in the fertility of our soil, and in the mildness of our climate, though as nations, they are weak and despised, and their citizens are depraved and worthless. Nor will it suffice to say, that our national greatness is owing to the superiority of our laws. The laws of the United States are not better than those of

many other less important countries. No, it is neither of these causes that makes our country great, and our citizens the envy of the world. The true cause is to be found in the characters of our people. It is the great moral power of the ideas which are entertained by the citizens, that makes our nation great.

The great improvements in civilization since the Reformation, are the results of the dissemination of the principles of Christianity. When the Reformation spread abroad the great truths of Revelation, and placed in men's minds advanced thoughts and opinions, the great moral power of ideas began to exalt the people, and to advance the nations. In fact, the result could scarcely have been different. The same authority which taught, that all men are equal in the sight of God, also taught, that all men are equal before the law. As a consequence, in those countries in which the minds of the people were influenced by the teachings of Revelation, the equality of the citizens became more complete than it had been in any previous period in history.

Although the Reformation, strictly speaking, was a religious movement, yet in effect it was a momentous political advance. The changes which it wrought in the habits of thought and dispositions of people, worked vast improvements in society, and great reforms in governments. It taught men to think and act differently from what they had previously done, and led to the formation of institutions for their government, different from those which had before existed. It taught men the right to think for themselves upon matters of religion, as well as upon the affairs of the State. It put into their minds ideas of self-government, which forced kings and rulers to recognize certain great rights and privileges of the citizens, and led to the creation of the freest governments ever known to men.

The champions of freedom, and those who were foremost in the struggles for the liberties of the people, in all the great contests between despotism and freedom, were men whose minds were imbued with the spirit of Christianity, and whose hearts were inspired by Christian ideas.

Such were the followers of Martin Luther in Germany, of John Knox in Scotland, of John Huss in Bohemia, and of Ulrich Zwinglius in Switzerland. The Huguenots in France, and the Protestant non-conformists in England, in bearing up the standard of religious freedom, upheld the

banner of civil liberty. And whilst they contended for the divine right of freedom of thought in matters pertaining to religion, they maintained the sacred rights of citizens to control the affairs of the State. So, too, the Puritans in England, in resisting the power of princes and potentates to control the consciences of the individuals upon religious matters, weakened the power of the crowned heads to regulate, by arbitrary decrees, matters touching the civil rights of the subjects. To the Puritans, more than to any one class of persons, are the people of Great Britain indebted for their present constitution. The gifted Hume, who was the friend and admirer of those in his country, who held the sceptre of kingly power, and who was no advocate of the claims of Christianity upon the State, says that, "The precious spark of liberty had been kindled, and was preserved by the Puritans, that it is to this sect alone that the English owe the whole freedom of their constitution. And to this testimony of Hume, might be added the eloquent tribute of Thomas Jefferson, the great apostle of freedom, to the zeal and heroism with which the Puritans of New England endured the severest trials in establishing and maintaining in the wilds of America, a government which guaranteed to the citizens, the most prized religious and civil privileges. Skeptical as were the opinions of this great American statesman upon matters of religion, his views upon political affairs should command our respect. When, therefore, he admits the services of this sect of Christians to the cause of civil liberty, his testimony is a weighty argument for the position contended for.

But who, within the sound of my voice, will require an argument to show the benefits which the cause of civil liberty gained from the Pilgrims of New England? Moved by religious zeal and sustained by Providence, they forsook their homes and crossed a wide and trackless sea, to an unknown land, where they planted a colony, from which has sprung the freest government ever known to men. This little band of religious heroes had learned in the land of their nativity the bitterness of interference, by the civil powers, with individual freedom of thought and opinion, and, joined together in the bonds of Christian faith, they determined to endure the trials of expatriation, that they might establish a government which would be religiously and politically free. Sad and weak indeed was their con-

dition when they landed upon the shores of Massachusetts. But their faith and the power of ideas made them strong. As their pastor knelt with his flock upon the ground, with the bleak and howling winds that blew around them they mingled their prayers to the God of nations and men, to sustain them in their efforts to form a government, in which freedom of thought and opinion might be enjoyed by all. With the Pilgrims, liberty, whether civil or religious, was a serious concern. They learned from Holy Writ, that all men were entitled to enjoy it. They regarded it as an inalienable gift to all men by their Creator. They looked upon it as a gift of heaven, which no power could wrest from them. They claimed it as such, they believed it to be such, and as such they were resolved to enjoy it.

It is the power of the ideas, and the faith in the opinions, which this noble band entertained, that the people of the United States are mostly indebted for the formation of a republican form of government. Though public sentiment, in this severely proper sect, at times required the observance of harsh rules of conduct, which amounted almost to tyranny, yet freedom of thought and opinion, and the right of self-government—ideas eminently Christian—were ever held by them to be sacred, and were taught to their children as fundamental principles of government.

By the framers of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States, these principles were laid as the corner stones, upon which has been erected the fabric of the civil government which we now enjoy. Our civil institutions owe their birth to a healthy public sentiment, and by this they must continue to exist. It becomes, then, pre-eminently, the duty of those who create public sentiment, to endeavor to form it in accordance with the pure and wholesome teachings of the Bible. It is from this source that justice, harmony, obedience to law, and all virtues can best be learned. Our national existence is sustained by public sentiment. It administers our laws, and protects the rights of the citizens. Laws cannot be enforced, unless public sentiment is in favor of their enforcement, and the citizens recognize the necessity of obedience to them. Unless this is the case, the penalty may be inflicted for the violation of the law, but the one suffering the penalty, will be regarded as a martyr.

The Bible teaches obedience to law, and those who form their opinions from the teachings of the blessed Master, will respect and obey the laws.

Order is Heaven's first law, and obedience to the powers that be, is a precept of Christianity, which the Bible plainly enjoins.

Let, then, the friends of education encourage the study of this Book of books. The diffusion of its principles, by creating a proper public sentiment, will prove to be the ark of our national safety, and the star which will surely guide our country in the path of greatness.

The most appalling danger that now threatens our nation, is the growing disregard of law. Articles in the political journals of the day, encouraging disregard of law and order, are not unfrequent occurrences.

If the laws which have been established for the government of society are violated with impunity—if offenders are permitted to go unpunished, and are lauded as men of true courage and honor, the number of offenders will soon become too great for the control of society, and the consequence will be the destruction of society itself.

We need fear no foreign foe, our swords have fought with theirs in deadly strife. We can build fleets and navies like theirs, and can marshal armies of men, as brave as ever faced a foe, or fell in freedom's holy cause. But when the laws of society are disregarded, and men cease to feel respect for them, we are in danger of being destroyed as a nation.

But let our citizens be guided by proper moral ideas and a public sentiment, such as Christianity inculcates, our country will grow in greatness and in power, until she reaches that high position of national influence and glory, which, doubtless, the Almighty Ruler designs her to attain.

ARTICLE V.

CHEMNICUS REDIVIVUS.

By Prof. H. E. JACOBS, A. M., Gettysburg, Pa.

We propose in this article to present a synopsis of the chief points contained in the first chapter of the "*Examen Concilii Tridentini*." We do so in order to bring this most important bulwark of our faith to the notice of those,

who hitherto have not had access to it, hoping that some may thus be led to its study, and that others may be benefited by its masterly discussions, even though presented in this imperfect form. We will endeavor to preserve, as nearly as possible, the line of argument pursued, as well as the spirit which animates it, although, in a mere abstract, much of its force is necessarily lost. With these introductory remarks, we leave the reader, and now let Dr. Martin Chemnitz speak for himself.

Of Holy Scripture.

For many years, there had been numerous complaints, that much error in doctrine, and very many abuses in rites, were prevalent in the Romish Church. It had been long expected that a Christian council would be convened, in which a remedy for such great evils would be provided. At the first session of the Council of Trent, the Pope, through his legates, announced that its design was, "by the removal of all errors, to preserve in the Church the purity of the Gospel,"—an object which was certainly very commendable. In the early Church councils, it was usual to place the Holy Gospels in the midst of the assemblies, in order to remind them what weapons to use, when contending for dogmas. The remark of Constantine, with which he opened the Council of Nice, is well known, viz.: "The writings of the Evangelists and Apostles, and the oracles of the ancient prophets instruct us clearly, what we should believe concerning divine things." What defences, then, did the Council of Trent determine to use, in support of its dogmas? Perhaps, the doctrine of the Holy Ghost, as set forth in the canonical Scriptures? By no means. For they declared, that Holy Scripture shall not be the sole norm and rule of our judgment, but (1) determined that unwritten traditions having the authority only of long usage, should be considered equal to Scripture; (2) they removed the distinction between the canonical and apocryphal books of the Bible, so as to make the authority of both classes equal; (3) they determined to regard the Vulgate edition as authentic, so that no one dare reject it, even though its difference from the original be very clearly proven. Fearing that even this was not sufficient, they add a fourth point, upon which they place the greatest stress, viz.: "If any one have the interpretation of the Roman Church, even though he do not see

how, or even whether it agree with the text, he has the Word of God itself."

Do you infer, therefore, dear reader, from the declaration of their god, the Romish Pope, that these Tridentine fathers convened actually with the purpose to correct and change, according to the Canonical Scriptures, any errors in their doctrines, or abuses in their rites, which, from the Word of God, could be proven to be such? For the decrees of the Council make a loud confession, before the whole world, that in their Church, the Papists have many things which can, in no manner be proved, established and defended from the canonical Scriptures; the very defences in addition to Scripture and contrary to it, which they collect and so skilfully arrange, signifying not only that they did not assemble for the purpose of amending anything, but also that their design was, by means of these artifices, to retain, defend, and place upon the neck of the Church, those errors and abuses which had been discovered and refuted from the Word.

These matters, however, must be carefully examined. We propose, at this time, to consider the principal topics of the Papists, concerning the insufficiency, obscurity, and uncertainty of Scripture, and concerning traditions, and the authority of interpretation.

Not to recount at length the calumnies of individual Papists against Scripture, we may sum up their position thus: "Holy Scripture is not a canon, norm, or rule, according to which all discussions concerning faith are to be settled, for two reasons, viz: 1. Because it is insufficient, not embracing everything necessary for faith and holiness of life. 2. Because, in that which it does contain, it is obscure and ambiguous." Hence, they say, it is a matter of contention, and not the voice of a judge, a dumb teacher, a dead, yea and killing letter.

This is a very serious and important matter. The Papists may ascribe to us freakishness, or a desire to dissent, or any other names which they please, but God, who searches all hearts, sees and knows, that according to His commandment, we earnestly endeavor to prove all things, in order that we may not be borne about by every wind of doctrine, but that our faith may have a sure foundation. If we either were angels, or lived among angels, there would be no necessity for care and anxiety, lest the purity of that doctrine which has been revealed from heaven,

may be either adulterated or lost ; but three very great obstacles are presented to us : 1. We are in this world, the judgment of which, in matters of faith, directly contradicts that of the Holy Ghost. 2. Our reason lifts itself up against the knowledge of God. 3. The devil is a liar, the father of lies, and the spirit of error. Hence, it happens, that doctrine divinely revealed, does not always, and everywhere, in this world, remain pure and incorrupt. Nor is the ordinary ministry a sufficiently sure criterion, Jer. 14: 14; 1 Kings 22: 22. Therefore, we should consider in what manner, God mercifully made provision for his Church, at all times, that it might be certain what doctrine is to be embraced as indubitable, heavenly and divine, and according to what norm, those corruptions which are to be avoided, may be recognized and judged.

Of the cause, origin, and use of Holy Scripture.

From the beginning of the world, God revealed himself and his will to the human race, by a sure word, and manifest miracles which he added thereto. In order that this doctrine divinely revealed, might be delivered orally to posterity, the Lord made Adam the bishop of his age, doubtless, bearing witness to his authority, and also granting him long life, that by his testimony, he might preserve the pure doctrine from corruptions. But not long after this revelation, Cain departed from the purity of the Word of God. After the death of Adam, not only the descendants of Cain, but also the sons of God corrupted their own ways ; in which corruption, there was without doubt, especially an adulteration of the Word. In the old world, therefore, the heavenly doctrine was transmitted by the living voice, without writing ; but inasmuch as the imagination of man's heart is evil, purity of doctrine was not faithfully preserved by traditions, but was corrupted and adulterated —yea, at length lost. For God said, My Spirit will not always strive with man. To Noah, God restored purity of doctrine, and added a fuller declaration of it, both before and after the flood ; which he again transmitted orally to posterity. When his descendants scattered, the posterity of Shem were chosen as the custodians of the purer doctrine. But consider how faithfully the oral tradition of the heavenly doctrine was preserved in that family, which then bore the title of the true Church. For two hundred years did not intervene between the confusion of tongues and the birth of Abraham ; and yet Terah, the

father of Abraham and Nahor, served other gods. From these observations, we can learn how unreliable is the guardianship of New Testament doctrine, which the Papists assign to unwritten traditions; especially as we have no promises now, concerning such new and peculiar revelations, as they then had. The world now, too, is in its extreme old age and dotage; then it was in its youth and full strength.

Again by peculiar revelations made to Abraham, God restored purity of doctrine. In the succeeding ages, speaking also immediately to Isaac and Jacob, he confirmed its purity. When Jacob was about to die, he commended this to his sons, to be diligently preserved and handed down to posterity. Although the patriarch Jacob left twelve sons, it is very likely that the tradition of the sound doctrine, was preserved without corruption. But from the death of the sons of Jacob to the departure from Egypt, not much more than a hundred years elapsed. But how faithfully, within a space of time so short, the purity of doctrine was preserved by traditions, appears from Ex. 20 : 7—10.

Just as before then, inasmuch as tradition did not preserve in purity the trust committed to it, God, by means of peculiar revelations, to which also many wonderful miracles were added, through Moses restored the purity of his doctrine, to the old sources of the Patriarchs, as the book of Genesis clearly shows.

I have thus briefly recounted the history of two thousand four hundred and fifty-four years, in which the heavenly doctrine revealed by God, was handed down, without divinely inspired Scripture, by the living voice alone, through the instrumentality of those who were ordained for this purpose, and whose commission was attested by revelations from heaven. We have thus shown how unfaithfully the tradition which had been received from the patriarchs, was retained and preserved by their posterity. These examples exhibit the manner in which traditions guard and preserve the heavenly doctrine. But then it seemed good to God, by means of new and peculiar revelations, to restore the purity of his word. It is not within our sphere to inquire why God used this mode and no other; we should consider only the manner, which in the time of Moses, he appointed, viz.: By means of writing, divinely approved and confirmed, to preserve purity of

doctrine, in order that new and peculiar revelations might not constantly be sought, on account of controversies arising concerning the old pure doctrine of the patriarchs. History shows, that God not only ordained, but also by his own example, since he was the first to write the Decalogue, began and consecrated the way, to preserve and retain the purity of the heavenly doctrine, by means of divinely inspired scripture. This adds much to the dignity and authority of Holy Scripture; for if the writing of the holy volumes had been begun by men, it could be opposed by the usage of more than two thousand years, in which, in the better ages of the world, divine doctrine had been handed down orally. But lest the writings of men of God might be esteemed of no authority for the confirmation of dogmas, and the refutation of errors, the Lord was unwilling to write the whole law himself, but commanded Moses to write the rest; and that the people of God might be sure that scripture was delivered, not by any human will, but that it was divinely inspired, God bore witness to the authority of Moses, by means of very great miracles.

The use of scripture, he expressly shows in Deut. 31, where he commands it to be read before all Israel, men, women, children and strangers, in order that those hearing, may learn to observe and fulfil all the words of this law; and commands the Levites: "Take this book of the law, and put it in the side of the ark of the covenant of the Lord your God, that it may be a witness against thee; for I know that after my death, ye will utterly corrupt yourselves, and turn aside from the way which I have commanded you." Hence, after the writing of the holy record, the Church of the children of Israel became the pillar and ground of the truth, not because it determined anything according to its own will, or from unwritten traditions, but because it was made the custodian of Holy Scripture, in which God declared the heavenly doctrine, Rom. 3 : 2.

After Moses, God raised up other prophets, whose faith and authority he approved by wonderful testimonies, as is clearly shown by the history of Elijah and Elisha. To Joshua he declared, Jos. 3 : 7, "This day will I begin to magnify thee in the sight of all Israel, that they may know that as I was with Moses, so I will be with thee." But although their authority was thus attested by miracles, yet they had no power to affirm, or declare anything concerning the doctrine of the patriarchs and Moses, contrary to that

which was written in the books of Moses, but from divine revelation, added clearer interpretations, as the light of the New Testament more nearly approached. They only wrote such a summary of his entire doctrine, as God deemed necessary for posterity; and their writings were placed with the books of Moses in the side of the ark. In this manner, the canon of the prophetic scriptures was composed.

I lay special stress upon this, in order that the Papists may see the kind of foundation which they have. For they cannot deny, that although more things were handed down by Moses and the prophets, than have been written, yet in the scriptures of the Old Testament, we have all of the doctrine of the patriarchs, Moses, and the prophets, which it is necessary for us to know. Our adversaries are compelled to admit this; for all the claims of the Jews are to be examined and tested, according to the norm of scripture, in order that that which agrees with it may be approved, and that which differs from it may be condemned. For when Christ and the apostles, in the New Testament, quote from the prophets, they do not refer us to unwritten traditions, but scripture. Those, too, who lived in the time of the prophets, simply cited scripture as the norm for deciding controversies, and testing corruptions. Thus, when in the time of Ahaz, the altar of the Lord was removed, and one from Damascus substituted, and corruptions were widely prevalent, which claimed the name and title of revelations, Is. 8 : 20, simply declared: "To the law and to the testimony; if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them." When Jehoshaphat was about to restore the true religion, after it had been corrupted by many superstitions, it is written, that "he walked in the first ways of his father David." 2 Chr. 17 : 4. But hear, according to what rule and norm the corruptions were cast aside, and purity of doctrine was restored, 2 Chr. 17 : 7—9: "In the third year of his reign, he sent to his princes, to teach in the cities of Judah; and with them he sent Levites, and Elishama and Jehoram priests. And they taught in Judah, and had the book of the law of the Lord with them; and went abroad throughout all the cities of Judah, and taught the people." So, also, when Hezekiah removed the corruptions introduced by Ahaz, 2 Chr. 31 : 4. It is worthy of notice, too, that when Manasseh and Ammon wished to lead the people

astray from the true religion of their fathers, to idolatry, they hid the book of the law of the Lord; for under king Josiah, Hilkiah the priest found it in the ruins of the temple. "And the king went up into the house of the Lord, and all the men of Judah, and all the inhabitants of Jerusalem with him, and the priests, and the prophets, and all the people, both small and great, and he read in their ears all the words of the book of the covenant, which was found in the house of the Lord. And the king made a covenant before the Lord, to walk after the Lord, and to keep his commandments, and his testimonies, and his statutes, with all their heart and all their soul, to perform the words of this covenant which were written in this book." 2 Kings 23:1-3. So, too, when the Prophets accuse the people concerning corruptions of doctrine, they say, that a departure has been made from the law of the Lord, which certainly is comprised in Scripture.

According to this norm, Paul, before king Agrippa, proves that he taught nothing false, or strange, Acts 26:22. Abraham also dismisses Dives from special revelations to the hearing of Moses and the Prophets; and that no one should understand this as referring to unwritten traditions, Christ, in recounting the doctrine of the fathers and apostles, from the beginning of the world, Luke 24:27, interprets Scripture, and says: "Thus it is written." This testimony is attentively to be considered. For, through his resurrection, Christ had already entered into his glory, and could have recounted many things concerning the true unwritten traditions of the patriarchs and prophets; but yet he brings forward only those things which are written. For he wished to prove, that in these are contained all things which answer the question, What was the doctrine and faith of the patriarchs and prophets?

We have shown, therefore, 1. The origin of divinely inspired Scripture, and who was its author. 2. The occasion, on account of which it was begun, viz.: Because, by tradition, purity of doctrine was not preserved, but, on the contrary, through it, many false opinions were introduced. 3. The use for which God ordained it, viz.: That it should be a norm and rule of faith, and of decisions in controversies. 4. That by divine inspiration, such portions of the doctrine of the patriarchs and prophets were selected for being committed to writing, as God deemed necessary and sufficient for posterity. 5. We have answered the objec-

tion which is urged against the perfection and sufficiency of the Scriptures of the Old Testament, viz.: That doctrine was taught by the patriarchs and prophets orally, more frequently, and in more words than could be comprised in a few small books.

These points considered aright, beautifully explain the discussion concerning the Scriptures of the New Testament. For the evangelists and apostles committed their doctrine to writing, for the same reason, on account of which Scripture first originated; and from this, we can judge most correctly the reason, cause, and use of the New Testament Scriptures. But first, a few remarks must be made concerning the traditions which are added to Scripture, as if it were imperfect, or which are opposed to it, as if it were ambiguous and obscure.

Resemblance of the Traditions of the Papists to those of the Pharisees and Talmudists.

The Gospel history clearly shows, that the purity of the doctrine of the Word of God, among the Jews, had been corrupted in the time of Christ. But if we should inquire into the cause and origin of these corruptions, since the Jews possessed and read the Holy Scriptures, the Gospel history replies, that these were due to false traditions. For although Scripture was clear, they opposed to it their traditions, so as to accommodate the Word of God to them, and to derive from them interpretations, having the title: "It has been said by one of old." Besides, they had many vain traditions, in addition to Scripture; the observance of which, they imagined so necessary, as either to prefer, or certainly make them equal to the written commandments of God. Whence do you think that this persuasion concerning traditions originated, unless from the idea, that the Scriptures of the Old Testament, did not comprehend all that was necessary for faith and piety of life? There is no doubt, that many traditions, neither false, nor vain, concerning the discourses of the patriarchs and prophets, were still treasured up in the memory of the pious. But then, when there was a departure from the pure doctrine, the persuasion at length arose, that inasmuch as the patriarchs and prophets, both did and said more than was written, traditions should be regarded with equal reverence and respect, although they did not agree, or even conflicted with Scripture.

Thus is shown the great resemblance between the traditions of the Pharisees, and those which the Papists seek to obtrude upon the Church. For the latter also pretend, that the observance of unwritten traditions is necessary.

But Andradius and his adherents will take exception to this; for they will say, that the Pharisees and Rabbies made their traditions; whilst the traditions of the Papists have been received from the apostles themselves, preserved by a constant succession of bishops, and handed down to our times. But the Jews also deny that their traditions have been framed, without authority, by mere men. For, they have invented a long and uninterrupted succession, by which the traditions which God himself delivered, and Moses received, are said to have been handed down to posterity in good faith. They teach, that on Mount Sinai, Moses received from God, not only what he wrote, but also a mystic and hidden explanation of the law, which he neither wrote, nor wished to be written, but delivered it orally, and thus also wished posterity to hand it down; and that both that which Moses wrote, and that which he handed down orally, are alike the word of God, and to be regarded with equal reverence. Consider what a splendid succession they have contrived, by which this tradition has been preserved. Moses, say they, delivered it to Eli the high-priest; Eli to Samuel the prophet; Samuel to king David; David to Ahijah the prophet; Ahijah to Elijah; Elijah to Elisha; Elisha to the high-priest Jehoiada; Jehoiada to Zachariah the prophet; Zachariah to Hosea; Hosea to Amos; Amos to Isaiah; Isaiah to Micah; Micah to Joel; Joel to Nahum; Nahum to Habakkuk; and then in a succession continued through Zephaniah, Jeremiah, Baruch, Ezra, until at length through Hillel, Simeon, Gamaliel, and others, it was transmitted to the authors of the Talmud. This succession is, indeed, much more respectable, than that of which the Papists boast in their line of Romish Popes, among whom there are many who are monsters, rather than men. Yet, I would like to hear what answer Andradius would give a Jew, who desired to free himself from the traditions of the Talmud. For I do not think that he has lost his reason to such an extent, as to decide, that the books of the Talmud are to be received with reverence, equal to that yielded to the Biblical Books.

The New Testament Scriptures.

Our opponents having felt this difficulty, seek to avoid

it by contending, that we must reason concerning the New, in a different way, from that in which we reason concerning the Old Testament. A peculiarity of the New Testament is, that God ordered it to be committed to writing, neither on tablets, or charts, nor with pen or ink, nor in any other way; but commended it to the minds of hearers, and determined that it should thus be preserved and handed down without writing: in proof of which they refer to *Jer. 31: 33*, and *2 Cor. 3: 3*.

What, therefore, shall we reply to this? Our answer is this: If God actually determined, that the doctrine of Christ and the apostles should be preserved without writing, and be transmitted only orally, we will be content to employ this mode, which we have above shown, God used for more than two thousand years from the beginning of the world. For he, of course, knew what was best. But the question is, as to whether God did actually determine upon such a mode. Inasmuch as in many things, the Papists have caused us to suspect their good faith, according to the command of Christ, *John 5: 39*, and the example of the Bereans, *Acts 17: 11*, we will search the Scriptures, in order to see whether the things which the Papists assert, are actually so. And, lo, we immediately discover, that that is not true which they say concerning the opinion of Jeremiah and Paul. The author of the epistle to the Hebrews, right in the midst of his discussion; whilst commanding in letters the doctrine of the New Testament, quotes the passage from Jeremiah, *Heb. 8: 10*. Paul, too, had already written both epistles to the Thessalonians, and the first epistle to the Corinthians, when he wrote the passage which they cite from him. So, that we must be excused for considering, that the apostles understood the meaning of Jeremiah and Paul much better, than do the Papists. They, no doubt, will again take exception to this, saying, that they do not declare that no portion of the doctrine of Christ and the apostles should be committed to writing; but only that many, and those the chief matters, are to be left to unwritten traditions. I am fully aware of this position, but the question here is, whether the meaning they ascribe to these passages, is that of Paul and Jeremiah. I examine the passage in Jeremiah, and do not find that he says, that the New Testament is to be written partly on charts, and partly in the hearts; nor do I find that Paul says, that of the doctrine of Christ and the apostles, some portions are

written with ink, on tablets or charts, and other,s by the Spirit of God, in the hearts. The true explanation of these passages I will briefly cite from Augustine: "The Old Testament is the law of commandments written outside of men; by which we are taught from without, our conscience bearing witness (for it is a work of the law written in our hearts,) as to the kind of obedience which God requires of us, and condemning those who do not live in conformity with this norm, but it does not afford the power of performing those things which it requires. For so sad is the corruption of nature through sin, that when God reveals his will, and presents it through the ministry, whether by voice, or in writing, yet the old man, inasmuch as he is without the spirit of regeneration, even when he exerts his own natural strength, and endeavors to do any thing, cannot truly understand, embrace, and observe the spiritual things which are presented in the Word. But the New Testament is the promise of grace, on account of the Son as Mediator; with which are joined the promise and offer of the Holy Ghost, who, by his efficacy and work, writes within the heart, the doctrine proclaimed, whether in writing, or orally by the ministry, *i. e.*, he enlightens the mind, and regenerates the heart and will, in order that we may be able to embrace from the heart, the promise concerning the Messiah. To those who believe in his name, gives he the power to become the sons of God, John 1:12. This is what Jeremiah means when he says, That the Holy Ghost writes the doctrine of the Gospel in the hearts of believers, in order to fulfill the promise: "I will be their God, and they shall be my people," even writing the law in the hearts of believers, so that in the inner man, they delight in the law of God, Rom. 7:22, and begin to obey it from the heart, Rom. 6:22." This most important doctrine contained in this passage of Jeremiah, the Papists not only pass over, but obscure and erase it, by the substitution of another explanation. For the Holy Ghost effects that concerning which Jeremiah speaks, not in any enthusiastic manner, without means, but through the ministry of God. In order, therefore, that the Word which is the only organ of the Holy Ghost, might not be adulterated, or be in any way uncertain, God commanded this to be committed to writing in the Old Testament. But we will now speak concerning the doctrine of Christ and the Apostles. We perfectly agree, as to the fact, that the doctrine of the New Testament is, that which Christ, in the time of his flesh, preached

in his ministry, with his own mouth, and which the Apostles, led into all truth by the Holy Ghost, preached throughout all the world to every creature.

It is evident that this doctrine was handed down orally, without writing for some years, and that afterwards it was committed to writing by the Apostles. Andradius having made mention of these first years of Christianity, in which the doctrine of the Gospel was delivered without writing, exclaims: "How great, therefore, is the impudence and boldness of these most trifling and abandoned men, who think that the manner of delivering, propagating, and preserving the Gospel, by which the Church of Christ was born, educated, and extended far and wide, is vain and trifling; for without controversy, that mode which the Son of God began, and the Holy Ghost leading the Apostles into all truth, employed, must be the best and safest for handing down, propagating, and preserving the doctrine of the Gospel." But to what does this amount? Any Talmudist, or Cabalist might employ this same argument in behalf of his own traditions, thus: "How great is the insolence of these most trifling and abandoned men, who wish no longer to receive that manner of handing down the Word of God, by which the first Church in the world was born, educated, and for two thousand four hundred and fifty four years, propagated and preserved? So that in addition to Scripture, they will not receive the Cabala with equal reverence."

But it does not follow, that because the Church of the New Testament was without the written Gospel for twenty years, on this account the Church would be better, if it were always without scripture. Andradius may, perhaps, deny that he means this; but then we again ask, What does such an argument as this which they argue, amount to? For twenty years the Apostles without writing, by tradition alone, propagated and preserved the doctrine of Gospel; therefore, even now, since the doctrine of the Gospel has been committed to writing, that first method is to be preserved, and in such a manner, too, that tradition may be opposed to Scripture?

If we be asked, why the doctrine of the Gospel was not immediately committed to writing, we answer, That it was first, by means of signs and wonders throughout the whole world, to be confirmed against the calumnies and contradictions of Jews and Gentiles, and to be approved by the assent of believers, so that we might be certain, that that

which was written, was not doubtful or uncertain, but as Luke says, surely believed, *i. e.*, confirmed by God, through the Apostles, throughout the whole world.

In order that this truth may be made clear, we will inquire concerning each of the books of the New Testament in order, on account of what causes, and with what design they were committed to writing, and what use both the writers themselves, and the primitive Church wished to make of them.

1. The earliest scripture of the New Testament, is the decree of the Council at Jerusalem, Acts 15. The very first words of this decree are: "Forasmuch as we have heard, that certain which went out from us, have troubled you with words subverting your souls, saying, Ye must be circumcised and keep the law, to whom we gave no commandments," &c. The design, therefore, of this writing was, that thereby the true and genuine opinion of the Apostles might be declared, lest any one might obtrude upon the Church, an adulterated, or supposititious decision, as if it had been handed down from the Apostles. Therefore, the experience of the very first years of the preaching of the Gospel shows, that its purity could not be preserved by traditions, and that it needed the safe-guard of writing.

2. Matthew is universally acknowledged to have been the first of the Evangelists to write. The following reasons, on account of which he wrote, have been given: * *a.* To communicate, by means of writing, what his necessary absence prevented him from teaching orally. *b.* To preserve in letters, what could not be retained in the weak memories of his hearers. *c.* That those who had not an opportunity to hear the voice of the Apostles, might have in writing, a summary of the doctrine which they taught. *d.* To counteract the efforts of heretics, to obtrude their errors upon the Church, under the name of Gospel.

History also teaches us, † that the Apostles and apostolic men regarded the Gospel of Matthew with reverence, and by their own example, taught the Church the proper use to make of it.

3. Almost all give the second place in order of time to Mark, although Clemens Alexandrius places Luke before

* Eusebius, Chrysostom, Thomas Aquinas.

† Jerome and Nicephorus.

him, and Irenæus even declares, that Mark wrote after the death of Peter and Paul. Concerning him, the testimony of antiquity is, that he committed to writing that which Peter his preceptor taught.*

4. There is no necessity to adduce the testimony of others, as to the design for which Luke wrote; for his introduction clearly explains this, Luke 1:1—4. Even in the time of the Apostles, then, it was necessary to provide such a remedy against the danger of an adulteration of doctrine. Special attention is to be paid to *ἀσπάσασθαι*, verse 4, which denotes the most careful guardianship, as in Acts 16:23; Matt. 27:65, or such a strengthening of anything against foreign force attacking it, that it may be preserved without the least injury. For such a guardianship of purity of doctrine, contrary to the attacks of corruptions, Luke declares, that he wrote his gospel.

5. John had survived all the Apostles. Although their writings were received, yet the heretics Ebion and Cerinthus arose, who originated a controversy concerning the divinity of Christ, maintaining, that some of the Apostles had orally transmitted certain doctrines, which were not contained in the written records. Against this very heresy, John wrote his Gospel. Its conclusion is especially noteworthy, in which the Apostle says, that in the writings of the Evangelists, all things are included which are necessary for faith and salvation, John 20:31: "These are written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and, that believing, you might have life through his name." The reason that not everything was written, John tells us, not as the Pope would, on the pretext and title of traditions, but because the world could not contain them. Of this, Augustine correctly remarks, that it must not be understood as referring to the mass of books, but that the Holy Ghost had written in Scripture as much as believers, in the infirmity of this life could receive.

Properly speaking, there is no difference between the doctrine of Christ and the Apostles. Yet, for the sake of order, we prefer to make a distinction here, according to the explanation of Luke, Acts 1:1, considering the former as "all that Jesus began both to do and teach, until the day in which he was taken up." This doctrine concerning the words and works of Christ, so far as the Holy Ghost

* Irenæus, Eusebius, Nicephorus.

judged that they were necessary to be known, we have shown, has been comprised in the writings of the Evangelists. But by the doctrine of the Apostles, we understand that which after the ascension of Christ, they proclaimed throughout the whole world. Of this, we will now speak. It is evident, that the Apostles at first published their doctrine orally, appealing, in confirmation of what they said, to the Scriptures of the Old Testament. Their design in afterwards committing their doctrine to writing, we propose to consider, just as we have considered the writings of the Evangelists. If we can prove that the doctrine of the Apostles has been committed to writing, to such an extent as the Holy Ghost deemed necessary for faith and life, we establish the fact, that the Holy Scriptures are the canon, norm, rule, ground, and pillar of our whole faith, so that to this rule, all matters involved in religious controversies are to be brought, and by it to be examined.

1. In order that there might be no necessity either to divine from conjecture, or to seek in the prattle of traditions, what was the first state of the Church, the Holy Ghost desired that there should exist in the Church, to all posterity, a certain, authentic, and canonical writing, since he was not ignorant, that under this title, much that was uncertain, vain, supposititious, and false, would be obtruded upon the Church. For, since Luke, by the writing of his Gospel, had obtained credit and authority in the Church, he also prepared a history of the Acts of the Apostles. This history supplies us with all the information concerning them, which it is necessary for us to know. But against this, they urge the fact, that this book does not contain a complete account of all the acts of each of the Apostles. For instance, very little is narrated concerning Peter; and so also from 2 Cor. XI, Rom. XV, Gal. I and II, it is manifest, that very many particulars in the life of Paul are omitted. We reply: The same test applied to the Old Testament will show, that the acts of not all the patriarchs or prophets are recorded. Not all the prophets committed their doctrine to writing, yea, the writings of some, as Nathan, Gad, Shemiah, and others, God has permitted to be lost. Inasmuch, too, as the faith of the Apostles was one, their doctrine the same, and their ministry common, even if the acts of all the Apostles had been written, they would not have been different from those, of which we have a

record. Well has Augustine said: "Since the Lord, in the time of the Apostles, was unwilling that the acts of the remaining Apostles should be written, who of us will say what these were, or if he would dare to say it, whence will he prove it?"

The two chief objects for which St. Paul wrote his epistles, have been given by Nicephorus: *a.* As memorials embracing in a summary, that which they had delivered orally to the churches. *b.* As explanations of that which they deemed it necessary, that those who had already been instructed in the rudiments of the faith, should know more fully. This may be shown from the epistles in detail.

2. The first epistle to the Thessalonians, seems to be the one which was the earliest written. The occasion is given in Acts 17. A tumult had been excited by unbelieving Jews. Paul was fearful that some might be offended because of persecution, and being unable to go to the Thessalonian church, sends instead, this letter, exhorting them to walk as they had received of him, 1 Thess. 4:1. Another reason was to supply those things which were wanting to their faith. This he could not do orally, and, therefore, seeks to accomplish his purpose, by means of an epistle.

3. Second Thessalonians was written not long after. The second verse of the second chapter, gives us still another reason why the Apostle wrote. For, inasmuch as the doctrine of the Apostles had authority, on account of the testimony of the Spirit, by which it was accompanied, others, also claimed this; so that they boasted of the Spirit and divine revelations, and demanded that their words be received with reverence equal to that given to the Apostles. Hence, Paul writes: "Be not soon shaken in mind, or be troubled neither by spirit nor by word." If, then, even during the lives of the Apostles, there was danger from persons professing to teach Apostolic doctrine, how much greater would it be now, were reliance to be placed upon unwritten traditions.

But from this very epistle, the Papists derive an argument, which, like the shield of Achilles, they present against Scripture, in behalf of their own traditions. For Paul says (chapter 2:15): "Hold the traditions which ye have been taught, whether by word, or our epistle." "Therefore," say they, "it is very clear, that not everything necessary is comprised in the writings of the Apo-

ties, but only that those things, which having been delivered orally by the Apostles, through traditions have come to us, are to be received with equal reverence." I confess, that of all the arguments of the Papists against Scripture, none is more specious than this. For, by these words, at first Scripture seems to confess its own insufficiency, and to refer us to unwritten traditions. But I can reply, Paul was right in saying: "Hold the traditions which ye have been taught, whether by word, or our epistle," for their doctrine was not contrary or diverse, but one and the same. The preceding words clearly explain to what traditions he refers, 2 Thess. 2 : 13, 14. I grant, too, that when Paul wrote to the Thessalonians, not all things concerning the doctrine of Christ and the Apostles, which were to be received, had as yet been committed to writing. According to the opinion of Irenæus, which my adversary Andradius follows, neither Matthew, nor any other of the Evangelists had as yet written, and Paul had only written his first epistle, and was then writing his second. So that he was right in saying, and no one disputes it, that all things necessary to be believed, were not contained in these two epistles, and that the Thessalonians, in addition to it, should hold those things not contained in the epistle, which they had received from him orally. I can illustrate this. If any one, whilst the Old Testament canon was as yet incomplete, would have received the books of Moses, as the Pharisees afterwards did, so as to reject what the Prophets would deliver from God, he would be justly blamed. For then it would have been right to say: Hold the doctrine which God has delivered to you, whether by the writings of Moses, or by the mouth of the Prophets. But if any Cabalist or Talmudist, after the old Testament canon had been completed, would seek to use this in favor of his traditions, I ask Andradius and the other Papists, whether they would support the following argument: "In the time of the Prophets, it was correctly said, that the Word of God is to be received, not only as written by Moses, but also as delivered orally by the prophets; therefore, also, since the time of the prophets, when the Old Testament canon has been completed, not everything belonging to the doctrine of the patriarchs and prophets necessary to be held, is contained in the books of Holy Scripture, but especially those things also which Pharisees and Cabalists have published, under the title of traditions, are to be re-

ceived as of equal authority?" I do not think that Andradius would admit this.

4. I Timothy seems to be next in order of time, written from Phrygia, or Macedonia. Paul himself explains the reason for which it was written in 1 Tim. 3 : 15. This he surely did, not on account of any weakness on the part of Timothy; but inasmuch as the authority of Timothy was not equal to that of the Apostle, the latter wishes to consign to writing a testimonial of the office of his disciple, in order that no one might despise his youth, but that he might prove to others, that the office was entrusted to him by Paul, and that the Church might thus be sure that Timothy, when he preached these things, was a good minister of Christ. The book of Acts also tells us, that Timothy did not remain long at Ephesus. Another reason for this epistle, therefore, was, that after the departure of Timothy, they might have the Apostolic form of the ministry, as it is to be preserved in the Church, which is the pillar and ground of the truth.

5. The design of the epistle to Titus, is proved in the same manner, as is evident from the second and third chapters.

6 In the very beginning of his epistles to the Corinthians, Paul addresses them to "all who in every place call upon the name of the Lord Jesus." The reasons on account of which he wrote the first epistle to the Corinthians are these: As some had received the Gospel from Paul; others from Apollos; others from Peter, who had been one of Christ's personal companions, in the days of his flesh; and still others had heard Christ himself teaching, and had thus come to him, a contest had arisen in reference to the precedence of traditions. Paul therefore, shows, that a decision must be given, not according to a difference in the rank of the persons teaching, but according to the unity and truth of the doctrine. For "Other foundation can no man lay except that is laid, which is Christ Jesus." He who plants, and he who waters, are one. Thus he declares the agreement of his doctrine with that of the other Apostles, so that no one can object, that in the New Testament, we have the doctrine only of Paul, and not that of the other Apostles. But inasmuch as some of the Corinthians had departed from the form of the doctrine, which they had received orally from Paul, and certain corruptions in reference to sin, the Lord's Supper, and the resur-

rection, had entered the Church, he desired in this epistle, to commit to writing the chief points of his tradition, viz.: how he had laid the foundation, how he had given milk to the Corinthians, viz.: as he himself writes: "I determined not to know anything among you, save Jesus Christ and him crucified." Hence, he calls his preaching, the word of the Cross; and, in the fifteenth chapter, says: The Gospel which I preached unto you, which ye also have received, and wherein ye stood. For I delivered unto you first of all, that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins," etc. Therefore, the doctrine of Christ, just as taught by the Evangelists, was the subject of his preaching and tradition, and this he calls the foundation, chapter 3.

Hence, one reason of his writing was, in his absence, to teach what, whilst present he had delivered orally. Another reason was, inasmuch as the foundation was laid, to teach what Apostolic structure should be built upon it, to show what was gold, silver, precious stones, and how wood, hay and stubble which others build upon it, could be recognized. But, if any one should object, that either certain other important articles, or certain just explanations are to be desired in this epistle, we reply, that we do not so embrace any epistle of Paul, as not to consider and compare the rest; but, in the collected writings of the New Testament, we affirm, that we have all the articles of the Apostolic doctrine, and all such explanations as are necessary.

The second epistle to the Corinthians, was written not long afterwards from Macedonia. From Timothy, he had learned that there were some among the Corinthians who sought to attack his doctrine, by contending, that his authority was inferior to that of the other Apostles, who had seen the Lord. Hence, in this epistle, he claims for himself his true authority. The Church, therefore, was disturbed already in reference to traditions, whilst the Apostles were still living. The false teachers had taught also, that Paul in his absence, spoke by letter, very differently from what he did orally, when present; and, he, therefore, declares (1:18): "We write none other things unto you, than what ye read, or acknowledge," thus declaring, that he wrote nothing else than what, whilst present, he had delivered orally, and signifying, that they should subject his epistles to the judgment of those, who were prophets, or spiritual. He, therefore, teaches now in no way

different from that which he used, whilst giving oral instruction, during his life.

7. The design of the epistle to the Romans, Paul himself explains (15 : 14, 15, 16,) : "I myself also am persuaded of you, my brethren, that ye also are full of goodness, filled with all knowledge, able also to admonish one another; nevertheless, brethren, I have written the more boldly unto you, in some sort, as putting you in mind, because of the grace that is given me of God, that I should be the minister of Jesus Christ to the Gentiles, ministering the Gospel of God, that the offering up of the Gentiles might be acceptable." Theodoret asks, why the epistle to the Romans was given the first place, when it was not the first written, and answers, that this was done because it contains doctrine of every kind, and a full and accurate discussion of dogmas.

8. The remaining epistles were written during his imprisonment. The Galatians had departed from the doctrine of the Gospel, as they had received it from Paul. But, as the epistle clearly shows, they had not entirely cast away their profession of the Gospel, but still retained the Old Testament history, and the history concerning Christ. But, Paul affirms, that they had deprived themselves of the Gospel, by losing the distinction between the Law and the Gospel, and the true office and use of each; by not preserving aright the purity of the doctrine concerning sin, the works of the law, justification by faith, and the consequent renewal. Here, we must attentively observe, that the doctrine of the Gospel, consists not only in either historical narration, or assent, concerning the words and deeds of Christ, and the rest which is narrated in Holy Scriptures; but especially in its true interpretation and accommodation to repentance, faith, justification, hope and love. It is for this, that Paul contends, in the epistle to the Galatians.

But we will consider what remedy he opposed to these corruptions, which, under the name of traditions, were so widely diffused. He shows his authority by many arguments, leads the Galatians to that Gospel, which they had before received from his voice, and adds: "Though we," the apostles, "or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you, than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed." What the Gospel was, which Paul had preached to the Galatians, and they had

received, there is no necessity for us to divine either from conjecture, or the report of unwritten traditions. For Paul has fully explained this in the epistle to the Galatians. Hence, Basil and Augustine have correctly applied this passage of Paul to Scripture, thus: If any one preach any other gospel in addition to that which is comprised and delivered in Scripture, let him be accursed. For Paul does not say merely, "contrary," but, if it be "in addition to" (*παρ ὅ*) this, even though it be the least particle of leaven, the purity of the whole mass is corrupted thereby.

9. In Ephesians 3 : 3, 4, we find a passage declaring the design of the writings of St. Paul, "As I wrote afore in a few words, whereby, when ye read, ye may understand my knowledge in the mystery of Christ." If, therefore, the question be asked, What was the mystery, the knowledge of which, Paul had received by the revelation of the Son of God, which he had announced among the Gentiles, which believing Jews and Gentiles had received, which the Ephesians had heard, when Paul declared to them the whole council of God, through which they would be built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets? Paul replies, that this he had written before, indeed, briefly, but yet in such a manner, that according to this as a norm, his knowledge into the mystery of Christ could be understood.

10. The epistle to the Philippians, also affords testimony upon this point. For it says (3 : 1,): "To write the same things to you, to me indeed is not grievous, but for you it is safe." But this "same things," cannot refer to other epistles which he had before written to the Philippians; for of this, there is no proof. Therefore, it must refer to that which he had before delivered to them orally, to which there is a reference in Phil. 4 : 9: "Those things which ye have both learned, and received, and heard, and seen in me, do." For thus writing, that which he had previously preached, he adds the reason: "To me, indeed, is not grievous, but for you it is safe," (*ἀσφαλές*.) How beautifully this last word declares the cause, on account of which Scripture is written, we have considered above, in connection with the Gospel of Luke.

11. For these reasons, Paul wrote to those churches, which he had founded and instructed orally. But the Colossians and Laodiceans never saw his face in the flesh. He tells us the design for which he wrote to them in Col.

2 : 1—4. The Colossians had learned the Gospel from Epaphras; but Paul wrote to them: *a.* That from the written approval of an apostle, they might have confidence, that that which they had received from Epaphras, who was not an apostle, was not an uncertain or corrupted dogma, but the word of truth of the Gospel, which was preached under the whole heaven. *b.* That they might not be led astray by philosophy, or the traditions of men, Paul shows that his anxiety, lest anything either under his own name, or that of others, should be diffused, is so great, that he calls it *άγνωστον*. As, therefore, he could not be personally present, he performs this office by means of writing. In so doing, he did not write merely the words, That is true which Epaphras has taught you; but he repeats the heads of the doctrine of the Apostles, in order, that recognizing it as the same, they might thus have confidence in that which they had heard from Epaphras. But Paul wrote this epistle not only for the use of the Colossians, but wished it to be read also in the church of the Laodiceans, who, like the Colossians, had not seen his face in the flesh. Therefore, these epistles were, likewise, intended for all of us, who have not heard the voice of Paul, and seen his face in the flesh, in order that from them we might have assurance of faith. This is the design of Paul, and upon it hangs the entire controversy between us and the Papists.

12. Here, we may also add an observation from the epistle to the Hebrews. Concerning its author, we will not now treat. He says (2 : 1,): Lest παραδοθῆμεν. For Chrysostom says correctly, that when the heard word is not retained, or preserved, it is said to flow out. Hence, we learn why the epistle was written, viz.: That those things should not flow out, which had been received from tradition. Although in the last chapter he tells us, that he has written in few words, yet he embraces two things, in which the sum of the Apostolic doctrine is comprised. For the fifth and sixth chapters show the rudiments of the Apostolic doctrine, as declared in the Churches, in the time of the Apostles. Only the mere heads are there recounted; their full explanation, we find in the other writings of the Apostles. But the principal argument of the epistle to the Hebrews, is this: What is to be understood as the solid food of adults, which was usually given them, after they had received the first rudiments of the Christian faith.

13. Of the epistles of Paul, there yet remains the second to Timothy. Inasmuch as this was written a little before his death, and Paul wished to leave it, as it were, in the place of a last will and testament, its testimony in reference to the entire Scripture of the New Testament, is of especial importance. He says (1 : 13, 14.): "Hold fast the form of sound words, which thou hast heard of me." "That good thing which was committed unto thee, keep by the Holy Ghost." Chap. 2 : 2: "The things that thou hast heard of me, among many witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also." Chap. 3 : 14: "Continue thou in the things which thou hast heard and been assured of, knowing of whom thou hast learned them." There is no doubt that these passages refer to the doctrine which Paul had delivered orally to Timothy. But whence can we, who have heard the voice neither of Paul, nor Timothy, be certain as to what traditions were intrusted to Timothy by Paul? It has been clearly shown, that for this very reason, Paul committed his doctrine to letters.

Just as John wrote: "These are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing, ye might have life." So, also, Paul says in this epistle (3 : 15.): "The Holy Scriptures are able to make thee wise unto salvation through faith in Christ Jesus." Repetitions of this kind add to their weight. The connection clearly shows, that reference is here made to the Scriptures both of the Old and New Testaments. Those of the New Testament had not been written when Timothy was a child; hence, the reference must be, at least partially to those of the Old Testament. But to infer that those of the New Testament were excluded, would be equivalent to make the Apostle say, that those of this class, which were then extant, were not divinely inspired, nor profitable for doctrine. As he says, "all Scripture," he evidently means that of both Testaments. For, as all the canonical writings had then been published, except those of John; and there was no doubt concerning the inspiration of the Old Testament, Paul here speaks principally concerning those of the New Testament. But you may object, that no one denies that the Scripture of the New Testament is profitable; yet, to infer from this, its sufficiency is not a legitimate mode of reasoning. For the book of Ruth also is profitable for doctrine. But, who would

infer from this, that it contained everything necessary for faith and life, so that nothing should be received, except what could be directly proven from it? I reply: If Paul had said only, "All Scripture is profitable for doctrine," I grant that this would not declare its sufficiency. But he adds, "that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto good works." From 1 Tim. 6:11, it is evident that the term "man of God," here refers to "minister of the Gospel." The design of Scripture therefore, is, that the minister of the Gospel may be perfect, *i. e.*, complete in all parts, *ἀπτος*. The uses of Scripture, as Paul recounts them, show its perfection and sufficiency. He maintains four: 1. *Διδασκαλιαν*, referring to the setting forth and proof of doctrines. 2. *Ἐλεγχον*, the refutation of false doctrine. 3. *Παιδιαν*, to which he adds in righteousness, *i. e.*, the ordering of a pious life, and instruction in morals. 4. *Ἐναρμονιων*, according to which, that in life and customs, which does not agree with the divine will, it discovered and corrected.

We have, therefore, from Paul, in each of his epistles, the clearest testimony, for what reasons, with what design, and for what end he wrote, and commended them to the churches.

Peter, also declares the end for which he wrote, (5:12): "By Silvanus, a faithful brother unto you, as I suppose, I have written briefly, exhorting and testifying, that this is the true grace of God, wherein ye stand." This declares the same design which Paul gave for his epistles, as shown above, viz.: that when any one not an Apostle, professes to speak from Apostolic authority, he must bring some proof of the same from an Apostolic writing. For, if a mere pretext and title of traditions could satisfy the churches, it surely would not have been necessary for Peter to have delivered his own opinion in writing by a man having such high repute in the Church as Silvanus. Those in the present time, who seek to obtrude upon us traditions, (not to speak of them too harshly,) are by no means Silvani.

In the second epistle he explains the cause of his writing, still more fully and clearly. Having recited the chief points of Christian doctrine, he says (1:12): "Wherefore I will not be negligent always to put you in remembrance of these things, though you know them, and be established

in the present truth ;" and adds this reason : "That ye may be able, after my decease, always to have these things in remembrance," v. 15. "For there shall be false teachers among you who shall with feigned words make merchandise of you." Peter, therefore, recounts two reasons on account of which he wrote : 1. That those who would not hear the voice of the Apostles, yet might have and preserve the pure doctrine which the Apostles proclaimed. 2. He says that he writes, because of false teachers who would arise in the Church ; and he calls their corruptions feigned words, viz.: Those which they feigned to have been delivered and received from the Apostles. Neither does he speak only of dangers which belonged merely to that time. But "there shall be," he says. "There shall come in the last days." Peter therefore, did not judge, that the memory of doctrines could be preserved by traditions. Nor does he speak of his own writings only, but concludes (2 Peter 3 : 15.) : "Even as our beloved brother Paul, also according to the wisdom given unto him, hath written unto you, as also in all his epistles," etc. By this commendation he declares, that they belong not merely to the particular churches to which they were written, but that they contain universal doctrine, belonging to all who have obtained like precious faith with the Apostles ; for to these Peter writes, and says : Paul has written. But they say : Peter nevertheless affirms, that the epistles of Paul "are hard to be understood, which they who are unlearned and unstable, wrest to their own destruction ;" and hence infer, that it is dangerous to use the Scriptures, and safer to rely upon traditions. I reply : Peter does not say, that the epistles of Paul are written in such a manner, as by their difficulty and obscurity, to afford his readers an occasion for destruction ; for he uses not the feminine, but the neuter article, thus signifying the subjects of which Paul treats, which are placed far above the sight of reason, and cannot be understood aright by carnal men, but for this the enlightening influences of the Holy Ghost are needed. Nor does he say, that all the doctrines of the epistles of Paul, but only, that some are hard to be understood. These, too, he does not say, afford readers an occasion for destruction, but unlearned and unstable men *wrest* them." This fortune Peter says, is common to the epistles of Paul, with the rest of Scripture. For, he says : "As they do also the other Scriptures." But does Peter on that account

dissuade us from the reading of Scripture? By no means: but declares the cause and end of this remembrance, by saying: "Ye therefore, beloved, seeing ye know these things, beware lest ye also, being led away with the error of the wicked, fall from your own steadfastness." We have, therefore, the judgment of Peter also, concerning his own epistles, those of Paul, and the other Scriptures, with what design, on account of what causes, and for what end, they have been delivered to the Church.

15. Let us hear also the testimony of John on this subject. He begins his first epistle with a description of the preaching of the Apostles. "That which was from the beginning, which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, and our hands have handled of the word of life," etc., "declare we unto you." To this he adds, v. 4: "These things write we unto you, that your joy may be full. This then is the message which we have heard from him, and declare unto you," etc. John thus declares, that the Apostolic writings are messages from Christ. In the second chapter he says: "Let that therefore abide in you, which ye have heard from the beginning." So, also, "Ye have an unction from the Holy One, and ye know all things." There is no doubt that these passages have reference to the oral discourses of the Apostle. But hear what John says, v. 7: "I write no new commandment unto you, but the old commandment which ye had from the beginning. The old commandment is the word, which ye have heard from the beginning." Therefore, he who remains in that which has been written, truly remains in those things which from the beginning were delivered to the Church by the Apostles. But why did John write what they before had heard and learned? "These things," says he, "have I written unto you concerning those which seduce you." Lest under the pretext of the unction which they had, anything should be obtruded upon the Church, he adds: "I have not written unto you, because ye know not the truth, but because ye know it." That, therefore, which they had learned, from the anointing of the Holy Ghost, John wrote. The end for which he did this, and the use of Scripture, he expressly declares, 1 John 2: 11, 12, 13. So, too, 1 John 4: 1: "Believe not every spirit, but prove the spirits, whether they are of God." How he desires the spirits to be tested, is very evident from what he says in other portions of the epistle, in which he says: "This

is the commandment," "This is the testimony." In the conclusion of the epistle, (1 John 5 : 13,) he declares : "These things have I written unto you, that believe on the name of the Son of God ; that ye may know that ye have eternal life." We merely quote the passages. The testimony which they give is so clear, that there is no necessity to add more.

In the Revelation of John, it is especially to be observed, that he several times received a command from the Son of God, to write to the churches, the things which he both saw and heard. Yet, so great is the shamelessness of Eck, Pighius and Andradius, that they do not fear to say, that the Apostles received a command from the Son of God, not to write, but only to preach the Gospel. John was not permitted to write everything, Rev. 10 : 4, but only those things which are necessary, and can be apprehended. The close of the book records a threatening of plagues against him, who would either add to its words, or take anything from them. Therefore, we have the same commandment concerning the Scriptures of the New Testament, as we have concerning those of the Old. "Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you ; neither shall ye diminish aught from it, that ye may keep the commandments of the Lord your God which I command you."

Jude says of his epistle, that the necessity of writing was imposed upon him by certain false teachers, who had crept into the Church unawares. His design was to contend for the faith once delivered to the saints. That Jude refers to the writings of the Apostles, is evident from the fact, that he quotes almost to the very word, portions of the second epistle of Peter. To these he added other matters, which he thought desirable for the preservation of purity of doctrine.

Because in the second and third epistles which bear the name of John, it is said : "Having many things to write unto you, I would not write with paper and ink ; but I trust to come unto you, and speak face to face." This Lindanus interprets as meaning that the chief articles of faith, and the more profound doctrines of Christianity, the Apostles were unwilling to entrust to papyrus and perishable ink, but in order that they might be lasting, to commit them to traditions. That the text either says, or means this, is manifestly false. Since the author of these epistles

was unwilling to write those many things to which he alludes, we may reply in the words of Augustine: "Who is it that declares what they are; and if he would dare to speak, whence will he prove it?"

The sum of that which we have shown is this: The Apostles committed their doctrine to writing: 1. To repeat and recall to memory what, whilst present, they had delivered orally. 2. To explain by epistle, these doctrines which were to be built upon the first principles of faith. 3. Because the churches were disturbed, and doctrine was corrupted, under the pretext of traditions professedly from the Apostles. 4. Because the doctrine received from the Apostles orally, was not faithfully preserved by tradition. 5. That other teachers, who were not Apostles, might have written testimony, whence they could prove to the churches that what they asserted, was Apostolic doctrine. 6. That the churches which could not hear the voice of the Apostles, might know what doctrine to receive as truly Apostolic. 7. The same things which the Apostles, when present, had delivered orally, afterwards being absent, they embraced in their writings. 8. In the writings of the Apostles, I have not cited a mere catalogue of the chief points of Apostolic doctrine, but also correct explanations. 9. That the canon of Christian faith is contained in Scripture. 10. That from the writings of the Apostles we might learn their knowledge into the mysteries of Christ. 11. That in the infirmity of this life, believers might comprehend the mysteries of the Gospel, so far as they are able. 12. What they first delivered, they afterward committed to writing, in order that purity of doctrine might be preserved from corruptions. 13. The Apostles embraced, in their writings, both the elements of Christian faith, and the fuller doctrine which follows. 14. All Scripture given by inspiration of God is profitable, that the man of God may be thoroughly furnished unto every good work. 15. That the Church, after their death, might have a means of retaining and preserving Apostolic doctrine. 16. That there might be in the Church a rule, according to which the ministry might be constituted. 17. That which the Apostles from the beginning delivered, they afterwards wrote for use in all ages, all churches, and all times. 18. They wrote both for those who already believed, and those who afterwards would become believers. 19. The command to write, they received from the Son of God

himself. 20. The origin, design, and use of the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments is the same, so that to each nothing is to be added, nothing subtracted, nothing turned to the right or left hand.

In opposition to all the quibbles and sophisms of the Papists, these facts clearly and firmly prove, and confirm the authority, perfection, and sufficiency of Holy Scripture in the New Testament. For, just as the old writers declare, that nothing is to be declared of God, except that which He himself has revealed and testified; so, also, we believe, that which Scripture reveals and testifies of itself, because its author, the Holy Ghost, passes judgment upon his own work. Still we will add the argument of the old Church, concerning the authority, perfection, and sufficiency of Scripture. For we love and revere the testimonies of the older and purer Church, by the harmony of which we are aided and strengthened, although our faith should depend upon the Word of God, and not on human authority. Hence, we do not place the testimonies of the fathers before Scripture, but we add them to it.*

But Andradius thinks, that with one argument, he can overthrow all the testimonies, both of the Word of God, and of the Fathers, concerning the perfection and sufficiency of Scripture. He has heard that geometrical demonstrations do not prove, so much as force conviction. This, therefore, is his demonstration: "God always has a Church in the world. But the true Church cannot be divided and separated from the true faith. Therefore, we must believe whatever the Church has delivered and believed, whether formerly or now, even though this can be proved by no passage of Scripture, and consequently not Scripture, but the opinion of the Church is the most accurate norm, by which our faith must be directed, and with which it must conform. This is, indeed, a powerful argument, which seeks at one blow to hurl Scripture from its place, as the rule and canon of our faith. By it, even Christ and the Apostles can be condemned, whenever their testimony conflicts with that of this Pharisaic Church. But a reply is very easy: "It is very true, that the true Church can never be separated from the true doctrine or faith. For the true Church is that which embraces and confesses the

* Here follow quite a number of pages of quotations from the Fathers.

true and sound doctrine of the Word of God. But when that organization (*coetus*), which has the title of Church, departs from the true doctrine of the Word of God, it does not follow either that the sound doctrine is false, or that the errors, which that organization embraces are truth; but it follows, that that organization, since it no longer has the true doctrine, is not the true Church. The truth of the Word of God, therefore, does not depend, as Andradius wishes, upon the Church; but, on the contrary, the truth of the Church depends, and is judged from the truth of the Word of God, which it embraces and confesses. For the Church is not an absolute and irresponsible organization; but ought to show and prove by sure and firm testimonies, that the doctrine which it embraces and professes, is divinely revealed, true, and sound. But this testimony it derives from the canonical books of Scripture. It is also to be noticed, that even in the true Church, upon the foundation, wood, hay, and stubble are often built. Sometimes, too, it happens, that the true Church is concealed as it were, beneath another corrupt organization, as when Elijah said, 1 Kings 19:14, "I, even I only, am left." "When the Son of Man cometh, shall he find faith upon earth?" But, if in the time of Elijah, any one had judged concerning the truth of the doctrine, from the agreement of the visible Church, he would have erred altogether. The question, as to whether the truth of the doctrine is to be decided from the position of the Church, or whether from doctrine divinely revealed we are to determine what is the true Church, has been decided by Christ, who has given us this sign: "My sheep hear my voice," and by Paul, who has said: "Ye are built upon the foundation of the prophets and apostles."

Besides this, the Papists have two other points, treating respectively of the uncertainty or ambiguity, and the obscurity of Scripture; but these my adversary Andradius, does not wish to discuss. For he grants, that nothing is truer, surer, firmer, and more unchangeable than Holy Scripture, and where it delivers dogmas or precepts, that it is certain and by no means ambiguous. In reference to its obscurity, he cannot cast aside that distinction, which in opposition to the Jesuits, I cited from Augustine, viz.: That although many passages in Scripture are obscure and difficult, yet, that everything that refers to faith and morals, is found in plain and clear passages.

Yet, in order that he may not seem idle, he declaims much concerning the great danger of obscure passages of Scripture, if any one curiously wrests them to his own wicked opinions. But in this entire declamation, he fights without an adversary. For, we also say, that obscure passages of Scripture, are not to be interpreted contrary to the meaning of those which are manifestly clear; yea, from obscure passages of Scripture, no doctrine is to be derived, which cannot be proved from other passages, the meaning of which is manifest.

Of the Canonical Books.

Three questions belong here: 1. Why Scripture is called canonical, and how this name confirms what we have thus far said concerning its authority, perfection and sufficiency? 2. By whom, and how was the canon of Scripture established, and whence Scripture has its canonical authority? 3. What books are canonical, and what apocryphal?

1. They trifle when they say, that Scripture is called canonical, because of authority granted it by the canon of some council; for they cannot name the council. Without doubt, the name is taken from Paul, who says, Gal. 6 : 16, "As many as walk," τῷ κανόνι τοῦτο. So, also, Phil. 3 : 16; 2 Cor. 10 : 13. The name is taken from Ps 19 : 4, where the word signifies a canon or rule, consisting of either a line or cord, which is applied to any building or work, in order that it may not vary from the pre-arranged order; but may be completed according to a true plan. The metaphor, by which the term has been transferred to the doctrine of the Apostles, is very appropriate. For the Church is the house of the living God, the builders of which, are the ministers of the Word. But, in order that the structure be begun aright, by the ministry of the Word, or the preaching of doctrine, and be completed in a right order, according to a plan, there is need of a certain canon or rule, with which the builders may compare their work. This rule is the doctrine of the Apostles, Ps. 19 : 4. But inasmuch as this, so far as it is sufficient and necessary, has been comprised in writings, it is called canonical Scripture, the canonical books, or the canon of Scripture, being such a rule that whatever agrees with it, is judged as correct, sound and Apostolic, but whatever does not agree with it; departing from it either by excess or defect, is considered aright as supposititious, corrupt and erroneous.

2. Whence does Scripture derive its authority? The Papists say: From the Church. This, Pighius interprets as meaning, that the authority of the Church is superior to Scripture; inasmuch as the authority of the Church has given to certain writings canonical authority, which they had, neither from themselves, nor from their authors. Some say, that the authority of the Church, is so superior to Scripture, that it could reject the Gospels written by the Apostles; and give canonical authority to the writings of those, who were not apostles, as Mark and Luke. Some, even do not fear to blaspheme divinely-inspired Scripture, saying, that if it would be deserted by the authority of the Church, it would be of no more account than the fables of Æsop. From these premises, they draw the inference, that what the Church delivers, even without the testimony of Scripture, has the same authority as Scripture, all the authority of which has been given it by the Church. All these positions are false. Canonical Scripture has its pre-eminent authority principally from the fact, that it is divinely inspired, *i. e.*, that it was delivered, not by the will of men, but that men of God moved thereto by the Holy Ghost, both spoke and wrote. That there might be no doubt, that the men whom he selected for this work, were divinely inspired in reference to what they wrote, he adorned them with many miracles and divine testimonies. Lastly, these divinely inspired writings, were entrusted to the Church, to preserve them with the greatest care, from all corruptions, and hand them down, as it were, to posterity. Scripture, then, has its canonical authority, principally from the Holy Ghost, by whose inspiration it was written. Secondly, from the writers to whom God granted certain peculiar evidences of truth. Finally, from the primitive Church as a witness, in whose time these writings were published and approved. But this testimony of the primitive Church has been handed down since then, in a constant succession, and been carefully preserved in the histories of antiquity, so that the succeeding Church may have a guard of the primitive testimony of the Church, concerning Scripture. There is, therefore, a very great difference between the testimony of the primitive Church in the time of the Apostles, that of the Church which directly followed Apostolic times, and received the testimony of the primitive Church, and that of the present.

Church. The last two have not the power of assigning anything to the sacred books, or separating anything from them, for which they cannot bring sure proofs from the testimony of the primitive Church.

Thus, from the allusions of the New Testament, we can infer what was the Old Testament canon. In the New Testament, John saw the writings of the three Evangelists, and approved of them. Paul signed his epistles with his own mark; Peter saw them, and commended them to the churches. John attached both his own testimony, and that of the Church, to his writings. Thus the canon of Scripture was formed.

This testimony of the primitive Church, concerning the genuine Scriptures of the Apostles, posterity which has followed, has so constantly and faithfully retained, that afterwards many writings which were published over the name of the Apostles were rejected, as supposititious and corrupt, because it could not be proven from the testimony of the early Church, that they had been either written by the Apostles, or approved by them whilst alive, and entrusted to the Church; and also, because they contained doctrine not harmonizing with that, which, being received from the Apostles, the Church was preserving in memory which was then still recent. Thus, Eusebius refers to three classes of Scriptures: 1. Those received by the unanimous testimony of the Church. 2. Those concerning which there was doubt, as to whether they were certainly written and published by those Apostles, whose name and title they bore, so that those concerning which there was contradiction in the testimony of the primitive Church, were not simply condemned, but were used and read as profitable; and just as the former class were called canonical or catholic, so also, the latter were termed hagiographa, ecclesiastical, and by Jerome, apocryphal. Such an accurate distinction was made, in order that there might be a certain canon, as a sure rule of dogmas in the Church; that they might know, says Cyprian, from what springs, the cups of the Word of God have been drawn. Of the second class, or Apocrypha, Jerome says, That the Church reads these for the edification of the people, but not for confirming the authority of any dogmas of the Church. The third class is altogether rejected. The question now is: 1. Whether the present Church can make those writings canonical, which the primitive Church rejected? The

answer is clear. No. 2. Can it reject those, which have clear and sure testimony to their authority, from the primitive Church? I do not think that any one would say this. 3. Can the present Church make those writings canonical, catholic, and equal to the first class, concerning which the primitive Church was in doubt? The Papists not only contend that it can, but they also usurp the authority of removing that distinction between the canonical and apocryphal books, which was made by the primitive Church. But, as we have already said, this authority is not possessed at present by the Church; for, in the same manner, it could either reject the canonical books, or canonize those which are false. For this entire matter depends upon the testimony of the Church, which existed at the time of the Apostles. What it received, the Church immediately following, has preserved in histories worthy of our reliance.

3. The third question is: "What books are, and what are not in the canon?" We do not now speak of the supposititious and false writings, of which Eusebius has given a catalogue. But the question now is, as to whether all the books found in the Vulgate edition of the Bible, possess the same certainty, and equal authority. The testimony of the ancient Church is very clear to the fact, that of these books, some are in the canon, and some are not, but are apocryphal. Of the Old Testament writings, the following are accounted apocryphal: The book of Wisdom, Syrach, Judith, Tobit, third and fourth Esdras, Baruch, the epistle of Jeremiah, the books of Maccabees, and portions of Esther and Daniel. The reason on account of which these have not canonical authority, is not obscure. For, some of these were written after the times of the prophets, and by those who had no divine testimonials of the certainty and authority of their doctrine. Others bear the names of prophets, but have no sure testimonials that they were written by those to whom they are ascribed.

Of the books of the New Testament, which have not sufficiently certain, firm, and concordant testimonials of their certainty and authority, the following are recounted. Eusebius says: "The Scriptures which are not regarded as indubitable, although known to many, are the following: The epistles of James, Jude, second Peter, and second and third John. Some reject the apocalypse, others place it among the certain Scriptures concerning which there is no doubt."

Jerome says: "The epistle of James is said to have been published under his name by some one else." Eusebius: "The epistle which is placed first among the Catholic epistles, is that ascribed to James the Just. But it must be known, that it is regarded not as genuine and authentic, but spurious and forged." "That which is published as the second epistle of Peter, we do not receive as legitimate." So also, Jerome: "The second epistle of Peter is rejected, because of the difference between its style, and that of the first." Eusebius again: "The second and third epistles of John are questioned." He adds the reason: "Because it was doubted, whether they were of John the Evangelist, or some one else possessing the same name." Again: "The fact should not be ignored, that some in the Roman Church, reject the epistle to the Hebrews.*

The reasons on account of which these are doubted, are: 1. Because in the early Church, sufficiently clear and firm testimonies cannot be found, that these books were approved by the Apostles, and commended to the Church. 2. Because it is not clear from the testimony of the early Church, that these books were written by those whose names they bear. 3. Since some of the early teachers assigned to them apostolic authority, and others denied it, the matter must be left in doubt. And yet against these testimonies of antiquity so clear, the Council of Trent, at its fourth session, decreed: "If any one receive not the entire books, in all their parts, just as they are in the ancient Vulgate edition, as sacred and canonical, let him be accursed." Therefore, let Eusebius, Jerome, Origen, Melito and the entire primitive Church, from whose testimony we have received what we have just recited, be accursed!

It may be asked, then, whether we entirely reject and condemn these books. We reply, By no means. Of what advantage then is this discussion? We reply, That the

* "Mr. Westcott, in an article on the canon, in Smith's Bible Dictionary, has fallen into a mistake in stating, that Gerhard agrees with Chemnitz, in classing the Antilegomena as Apocrypha. At considerable length, in his *Loci Theologici*, Gerhard discusses this subject, rejecting the term Apocryphal, and in place, styling them as canonical books of the second order, showing, that the doubt in the early Church, was not so much in reference to the authority of those books, as to their authors. For a notice of the divergence of our Lutheran divines on this point, see Schmidt's *Dogmatik* *in loco.*" (J.)

rule of faith and sound doctrine in the Church, may be certain. For nothing dare be proven from these books, which has not clear proof and testimony, from the canonical books. What is said in these books, is to be explained and understood, according to the analogy of that which is contained in the canonical Scriptures.

Of the versions of Scripture.

In the second decree of the fourth session, two facts in reference to the versions, or translations of Scripture, are to be noticed. 1. Because they contend concerning only the Latin editions; therefore, they indirectly condemn, as they do in other places openly, the translation of Scripture into the vernacular and popular tongues. 2. They declare the Vulgate edition so authentic, that no one may presume, upon any pretext, to reject it in sermons, readings, disquisitions, or expositions. Our answer is not obscure, if the origin of the versions be considered. God at first revealed the heavenly doctrine in the Hebrew tongue. For, before the flood, that was the only language of the human race; and, after the flood, God so ordered it, that his doctrine should be committed to writing in the letters of that tongue; because the Hebrew language is the mother of all others. Although afterwards the tongues were confounded, Gen. 11, yet, in those times, there seems to have been such an affinity between the languages, that Abraham converses in Chaldea, Egypt and Canaan, without an interpreter. Joseph in Egypt, Gen. 41, converses with his brothers, by means of an interpreter, yet the name which Pharaoh gave to Joseph, shows the great affinity of the language of Egypt, with the Hebrew tongue. The name Moses, which was given by Pharaoh's daughter, bears witness to the same fact. The friends of Job, coming from different regions, converse with him in Hebrew. In Deuteronomy 28, where the Lord threatening to bring enemies from remote countries, says: "Whose tongue thou shalt not understand." Therefore, on account of the affinity of the languages, that which God had delivered in the Hebrew tongue, could be read and understood even by others. But inasmuch as God did not deliver Scripture to us, in order that it should be a sealed book, or one which very few could read and understand, when, in the progress of time, the affinity of other languages with the Hebrew, became farther removed, so that the Hebrew could no longer

be understood by others, Scripture began to be translated into other languages, so that not only those well-versed in Hebrew, but other men also might read what concerned their salvation. Thus Daniel and Ezra began to write in Chaldee. Afterwards all Scripture was translated into the Syriac, or Chaldee; for this tongue was widely used. So also, when the Greek tongue began to be widely known, the Scripture of the Old Testament was translated into the Greek language. On the cross, Christ quoted the words of Scripture, in the Syriac idiom. The Apostles also, for the most part, used the Greek translation of the Old Testament. Hence, the design of translating the sacred volumes into vernacular and popular tongues, was approved of by Christ and the Apostles. So, also, the Ethiopian eunuch was reading Isaiah, not in the Hebrew, but in a Greek translation. These facts clearly show, that God wishes Holy Scripture to be read and understood by men of other languages.

Just as by the confusion of tongues, the purity of divinely revealed doctrine was lost and corrupted, so the Holy Ghost, by the diversity of tongues, on the day of Pentecost, again brought the Gentiles, by means of the Apostles into the unity of the faith. He gave the gift of tongues, in order that the doctrine of the New Testament, might be delivered not merely to some people, in one or two languages, but to all nations under heaven, in such a tongue as all could understand. God wished to hand down the Scriptures of the New Testament in Greek, because it was most widely used, as Cicero says in his oration for the Archian poet, §10. In the East, where the Greek language remained for a long time vernacular, the fathers used Greek in the churches, and in the same language, the people read the Scriptures. But in the West, where the Latin language prevailed, there began to be translations of Holy Scripture into Latin. Thus, Augustine says: "Those who have translated the Hebrew Scriptures into the Greek, can be counted; but the Latin interpreters, in no way." For the Latin was then the vernacular tongue, in which Augustine preached, and the people read their Scriptures and sang their psalms.

Since the Latin has ceased to be vernacular and popular, the question, therefore, to be decided is, whether we are permitted to translate Holy Scripture from the original, into those tongues, which have become prevalent now in our region? An affirmative decision, the Papists not only

condemn, but also persecute with flame and sword, contending only for the Latin version. But, from what we have already said, a true judgment concerning such barbarous tyranny is sufficiently clear; for where has God declared, that such dignity belongs only to the Latin, that in it alone Holy Scripture is to be read? The dignity of the Hebrew and Greek tongues, in which the Scriptures were originally written, is certainly much greater. Would it not be much better for them, therefore, to contend, that Holy Scripture is to be read only in these languages? But, perhaps, they would answer: "These are Greek, and cannot be read." Certainly God does not wish his doctrine to be known only by Latin men. For, if God commanded his doctrine to be delivered to nations of all tongues, this command cannot be obeyed, unless the doctrine of Scripture be translated into other languages, which are known to the people, to whom Christ is preached. For the doctrine of Gospel must be preached from Scripture; and in preaching, a tongue dare not be used which is not known to the hearers, 1 Cor. 14. But we ought not to have forgotten, that the faith of the Papists extends beyond Scripture, and that they can, therefore, teach without a translation of Scripture into the vulgar tongue. Yet it is truly the tyranny of Antichrist to slay innocent men, on account of the versions of Scripture in the vulgar tongues.

Another point in this decree refers to the Vulgate version, which we neither reject or condemn. It is useful to adopt a certain version, in order that the force of the words, and the proper meaning of the passage, may be judged from the sources. In this manner we retain the old versions; and if the authors of this decree at Trent, had gone no further, there would be no disagreement between us. But not content with this, they command, that the Vulgate version be regarded so authentic in public readings, discussions, sermons, or expositions, that no one dare, upon any pretext, reject it. But what if the Vulgate edition have not correctly rendered the Hebrew or Greek text? If either by the ignorance, or carelessness of the transcribers, some things have been changed, dare we not depart from the old version, and return to the original? Can we not prefer the fountains to the rivulets? The Tridentine fathers reply: "No one dare reject the Vulgate edition, on any pretext." Jerome himself renders many things differently from the Vulgate as we now have it.

We have from him a translation of the Psalms and Ecclesiastes, which differs very materially from the versions of these same books, given in the Vulgate. Jerome confesses that he revised the four Evangelists, by comparing them with the Greek texts, yet in interpreting Matthew, he discovered in the Vulgate edition some errors, as also in the epistles of Paul. Since that time, by the carelessness of drowsy transcribers, as the study of the languages was not pursued, how many mistakes, do you not suppose, have crept into the Vulgate edition! It certainly cannot be denied, that in many passages, the true meaning of the Psalms is not correctly rendered. This is so clear, that Lindanus admits it, and Andradius, who often shows that he is a Hebrew scholar of more than ordinary attainments, I think will not deny it. Gen. 9 : 6, is mutilated; for the Vulgate omits the words, "*by man*," which are found in the original. That most beautiful passage, Matt. 9 : 13, "*I am not come to call the righteous, but sinners*," is mutilated by the omission of the words, "*to repentance*." So, also, 1 John 5 : 18; Rom. 4 : 2; Rom. 11 : 6, "*And if by grace, then is it no more of works; otherwise, grace is no more grace*," is entirely omitted. The ignorance of the transcribers is manifest in many passages. Ezra 9, instead of *posillus*, they read *pax illius*; instead of *sepem, spem*. Judges 11, instead of *altera matre, adulteratu matre*. Ps. 131, instead of *ex victu, viduam*. 1 Samuel 19, for *cecidit*, they read *cecinit*. Many passages of the same kind have been noted by Valla, Stapulensis, Erasmus, etc.

Still, so great is the shamelessness of this assembly of Papists, that they do not fear without any exception to state, that the Vulgate edition is not to be rejected, upon any pretext; even though some passages have been rendered incorrectly, and others have been changed, mutilated and added, so as not to agree with the original. Thus the mistakes of the translator, the faults of transcribers, the additions and mutilations of men, they receive for the Word of God. Unwilling to drink from the pure fountains, they prefer the muddy brooks.

But they contend for the errors of the Vulgate, not without reason. For, in many passages, it is adapted to the Papish dogmas. Thus, the intercession of the Virgin Mary, they prove from a corrupt reading of Gen. 3 : 15, "*She shall bruise thy head*," contrary to the Hebrew, Chaldee, and Greek versions, and the testimony of all an-

tiquity. The sacrifice of the mass, they prove from a corruption of Gen. 14:18. "Melchizedek, king of Salem, offered bread and wine; for he was the priest of the most high God;" whereas, neither the verb, "offered," nor the conjunction, "for," is in the original. They excuse original sin from a mis-rendering of Gen. 6:5, which the old version gives as, "The imagination of the thoughts of man's heart, is prone to evil." For the invocation of saints, they cite the false readings of Job 5:1; Ps. 150:1. They attempt to prove doubt concerning the forgiveness of sins, from their reading of Eccl. 9:1, "No man knoweth whether he be worthy of love or hatred." So, too, all things which their councils lay down, they declare should be received on account of John 14:26, which the Vulgate reads: "He shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatever I will say to you." But the Greek has *ιπποτος ομιλησας*, "Whatsoever I have said," not "will say." The perfection of good works in this life, Staphylus proves from the corrupt text of the old version, Eph. 6:13, "That ye may be able in all things to stand." Marriage is enumerated among the sacraments, because the old version, Eph. 5:32, translates mystery by sacrament. The efficacy of extreme unction, is proved from James 5:14, 15, because the old version has the word *alleviare*, which is used in relation to spectres and incursions of Satan, although James has the word *τυπει*. Andradius in order to prove that in the baptized, no trace of sin remained, quotes Heb. 9:28, "Christ was once offered to exhaust the sins of many," and adds, "nothing remains of what is exhausted," although he knows that there is no such word in the Greek.

What the reader ought especially notice is, that the Council of Trent, in order to show that the Church has the power of dispensing with the essentials of the sacraments, contrary to the institution of Christ, abuses the equivocation of the old version, where, in 1 Cor. 4:1, the ministers of Christ are called the "stewards (*dispensatores*) of the mysteries of God." Therefore, in the sacraments, they can dispense with one form in the Supper; for they are dispensers. O good God, how great is the shamelessness of Antichrist, that in the light of so great knowledge of languages, he can play in a manner so childish, concerning a matter of such serious importance, when Paul calls ministers only *εισοδομοντος*!

Surely, therefore, it was not without a purpose, that the Council of Trent made the old Vulgate Latin edition of the Bible authentic, as we have thus shown.

Of the Interpretation of Scripture.

It is certain, that the doctrine of Scripture and its saving use, do not consist in words which are not understood, but in their true meaning and correct knowledge, as Christ has said, Matt. 18 : 23, "He that received seed into the good ground, is he that heareth the Word and *understandeth* it." Many passages of Scripture are explained in plain and clear words, and need no interpretation from without; for they explain themselves.

In those passages which are thus clear, all these matters are found which refer to faith and morals. But in addition to these, there are many difficult and obscure passages, the sense of which cannot be discovered at first sight. Inasmuch, however, as God neither has included them in his Word without purpose, nor desires them to be a pretext for error, he has provided for the gift of interpretation within the Church, 1 Cor. 14 : 26. This gift the Lord does not wish to be despised, or cast aside, but to be used within the Church, with reverence, as an organ and means for discovering and understanding the true sense of Scripture, Acts 8 : 31. But this gift of interpretation cannot be exercised without the Church, by the unregenerate; for it is the light of the Holy Ghost, kindled in the hearts of the pious. Concerning the unregenerate, Paul says, 1 Cor. 2 : 14, "The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, for they are foolishness unto him; neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." 2 Cor. 4 : 3, 4, "If our Gospel be hid, it is hid to them that are lost, in whom the god of this world hath blinded the minds of them which believe not, lest the light of the glorious Gospel of Christ should shine unto them." But in the Church, the Son of God, seated at the right hand of the Father, bestows such gifts for the edification of his body, Eph. 4 : 8, 11, 12.

It is also certain, that no one in the interpretation of Scripture, should rely upon his own wisdom, except in clear passages, 2 Peter 1 : 20. Those who presume to bend Scripture to their own sense of it, which they have framed beforehand, do so to their own destruction, 2 Peter 3 : 16. That reader, therefore, is the best who does not

bring any understanding to Scripture, but carries it away from Scripture. We, therefore, gratefully and reverently use the labors of the Fathers, who, by their comments, have profitably explained many passages of Scripture; and confess that we are not a little confirmed in reference to the true sense of Scripture, by the testimony of the early Church. For we do not believe, that any one can frame for himself an interpretation, conflicting with all antiquity, and of which there are evidently no testimonies in the Church.

What, therefore, in addition to this, can the Council of Trent desire? They have very artfully couched the language of this canon, in very general terms. Yet their meaning, which they have concealed here, but expressed elsewhere, may be reduced to four heads:

1. They contend that the gift of interpretation is bound to the ordinary succession of bishops, in such a manner, that whoever is elevated to this position, enjoys the gift. Thus, they say, that the Pope has all laws in his own breast, even though he be an idiot, or so forgetful as to know nothing of himself. Likewise, that he has his own will for a reason in everything which he wishes; so that he can change the form of the sacraments handed down from the Apostles, and administer them contrary to the first four Councils, and the words of the Gospel.

This is a false position. For Paul, 1 Cor. 12:11, treating concerning the gift of interpretation, distinctly says, "All things worketh that one and self-same Spirit, dividing to every man severally as he will;" and the entire history of the Old Testament shows how God frequently passed by the priests, and raised up from other tribes, prophets as the interpreters of his will.

2. They assign to the gift of interpretation, a sort of judicial authority, so that it is not necessary for them to prove their interpretation, by sure and firm reasons, but they wish us, without examination or inquiry, to adopt the sense obtruded upon us by those, who, without the declaration of the Spirit, arrogate to themselves the gift of interpretation. But Paul says (1 Thess. 5:19-21): "Quench not the Spirit. Despise not prophesying. Prove all things; hold fast that which is good." So, also, in Acts 17:11, he commends the example of the Bereans, who searched the Scriptures, in order to discover whether those things which they heard were so. In Acts 8:31, the eunuch describes

interpretation by the excellent word *σύντισσιν*. In 1 Cor. 14: 29, Paul describes how in obscure passages, pious teachers ought to seek a true interpretation, when they have communicated their opinions. "Let the prophets speak two or three, and let the others judge. If anything be revealed to another that sitteth by, let the first hold his peace."

The Church has not, then, any judicial right in interpreting; but there are certain rules according to which these interpretations must be made.

3. When the Papists adapt any passage of Scripture to their corruptions, they eagerly search the writings of the Fathers, and scrape together such extracts as suit their purpose, without regard to the agreement, or disagreement of these passages with Scripture; although even the Fathers are unwilling to bind readers to their writings in such a manner, that any one should be obliged to believe anything, merely because the Fathers have said it.

On the contrary, we use the labors of the old teachers with reverence and gratitude, but still, so as to retain our Christian liberty.

4. They arrogate to themselves also the right, even in the clearest passages of Scripture, to depart from the simple and true meaning, given us by the proper signification of the words, and to frame another, with such dictatorial authority, as to demand us to believe, not what Scripture simply, properly and openly says, but what they interpret for us. By this artifice, they elude the clearest passages, concerning justifying faith, concerning sin remaining in the regenerate, concerning the imperfection of good works in this life, concerning the free will, concerning the intercession of Christ," etc. Thus, when Christ says: "Drink ye all of this;" they say, "Not all; but only the priests." When, Heb. 13: 4, says: "Marriage is honorable in all;" they say, "Not in all; but only in laymen." When Christ says: "The kings of the Gentiles exercise lordship over them; but ye shall not be so," (Luke 22: 25, 26,) they wish to lead us away from this clear passage, and to receive, I know not what interpretation. Paul calls that a doctrine of devils, which forbids marriage; but all this is of no account; for they contend, that these words are not to be understood, as they sound, but as the Roman Church interprets them. In order to play thus with Scripture, with impunity, and avoid its authority, this canon

has been framed. Osius says of the Word of God: "If any one have the interpretation of the Roman Church concerning any passage of Scripture, even though he do not know or understand, whether, or how it agrees with the words of Scripture, he has the very Word of God." Thus, the interpretation of the Romish Church is: "Behold here are two swords," *i. e.*, the Roman Pope has the administration both of the spiritual and temporal power. Elisha made bitter waters sweet by throwing in salt, *i. e.*, in the Church, there ought still to be exorcised water, and salt which has been blessed, the efficacy of which, we must believe, prevails against the devil and sins. Ps. 8: 6, "Thou hast put all things under his feet," *i. e.*, in subjection to the Pope. "The beasts of the field," *i. e.*, men living on this earth. "The fish of the sea," *i. e.*, souls in purgatory. "The fowls of the air," *i. e.*, the souls of the blessed, which by canonization, the Pope can present to us as objects of adoration. Very many such—we cannot call them interpretations, but—puerilities exist in the public writings of the Papists. As the basis for authority to be afforded him in all such matters, Andradius covers many pages, with his declamations concerning implicit faith. By implicit, he means that which is hidden in anything; and, therefore that is implicit faith, by which we believe, that all things contained in Scripture are true, although many things escape our knowledge; for, in this life, we cannot examine and penetrate everything. Thus the saints of the Old Testament implicitly believed many things, which we in the New Testament explicitly believe. But, in this manner, Andradius contends without an adversary; for we grant all that he says. Yet, he knows well, that when the Papists contend for implicit faith, they understand it in quite a different sense; wishing by means of it to impose upon us the necessity of believing, whatever their Church holds and declares, even though there be no testimonies cited in favor of the position; and in such a manner, too, that it is not necessary either to think, or inquire, or understand what the objects of our faith are, or whether they have any foundation in the Word of God.

It is this concerning which we contend; not, as the Papists misrepresent us, as if in uncultivated men, any great knowledge of letters is required. Nevertheless, it is necessary, that they should confess the persuasion that the articles of faith, which are proposed, are not human inven-

tions, but divine sentences delivered from the Word of God. For, when to the uneducated, the words of the Ten Commandments, the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, the institution of Baptism, and the Lord's Supper, are propounded, there are the very words of Scripture, in which there is no doubt, that the sum of the heavenly doctrine is contained. Such faith of the uneducated, believing this, is not, therefore, the implicit faith of the Papists; for it embraces the very words and judgment of Scripture; whilst, on the other hand, the persuasion of implicit faith, tends either to prohibit, or teach, that there is no necessity to think and seek, whether those doctrines which are propounded, have certain, firm, and clear foundations in the Word of God; and asks us to believe simply upon the persuasion of the authority of persons. This persuasion is not true faith, but a servile opinion. For they impose not only upon the uneducated, but also upon the educated, the servitude not to see, or seek, or understand, where in Scripture, that which they propose, is founded; but simply to believe it, because the Pope and prelates of the Church have thus determined. This is the state of the discussion concerning implicit faith. We know, that the ability of all is not equal, and, that a profound knowledge of Scripture is not required of the less educated. Augustine, therefore, describes the true manner of catechising the unlettered, viz.: "That a summary of the heavenly doctrine revealed in Scripture, be propounded to them, and that afterwards they be led to Scripture itself, each one in proportion to the measure of his gift." Chrysostom often severely reproves the laity, because they left the reading of Scripture to the monks alone, and thus clearly censures that implicit faith, concerning which the Papists dispute. So, too, it was the desire of all the Fathers, to lead the people, not from Scripture to implicit faith of human persuasion, but from man to the knowledge of Scripture.

ARTICLE VI.

THE MINISTRY. ARTICLE FIFTH OF THE AUGSBURG CONFESSION.*

By CHARLES A. HAY, D. D., Professor in the Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, Pa.

The venerable Confession of our Church does not profess to be a systematically arranged body of Christian doctrine; and yet even the casual reader will not fail to observe that the topics, briefly discussed in its successive articles, are not taken up merely at random, but that they seem to follow one another in a simple, natural order.

The confessors begin with what naturally suggests itself as the fundamental article of all religious belief, viz. : The doctrine concerning GOD, his nature, works, &c.

Then follows the article concerning *Man* in his fallen and helpless condition, alienated from God by wicked works.

The third naturally follows, viz. : The doctrine concerning a *Mediator* between God and man, the *Divine Author of reconciliation*.

The fourth presents *the sole condition of reconciliation, Faith in Christ*.

And, next in order, they present the doctrine of the *Gospel Ministry*, as the *divinely appointed agency for bringing men into this state of reconciliation with God*.

To some reflections upon the article last mentioned, we respectfully invite your attention.

A wide and tempting field here opens before us—THE GOSPEL MINISTRY? Theme, worthy the pen of an angel—office, highest of all upon earth; with duties, prerogatives, responsibilities, trials, encouragements, rewards, all linking it with the life of its Divine Author, and reaching over into eternity.

We are admonished, at the outset, however, by various

* Fifth Lecture on the *Holman Foundation*, delivered June 27th, 1870, before the Theological Seminary of the General Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, Gettysburg, Pa.

considerations, to limit our remarks to but a few of the aspects of this great theme. Chief among these considerations is the fact, that some of the topics casually alluded to in the Article before us, are treated of *ex professo* in other parts of the Confession, and courtesy toward those who have preceded, and are to follow us, demands that we do not enlarge upon these. Besides, the main subject of the Article, viz.: *The Origin and Nature of the Gospel Ministry, with its Relation to the Church*, has of late been attracting special attention, and it has been deemed best, therefore, to confine the present discussions chiefly to these aspects of the theme.

We present, in the first place, a literal translation of the Article, as we have it in the standard German text, as follows:

"For the attainment of this faith, God has instituted the Office of the Ministry, has given the Gospel and the Sacraments, through which, as through means, He gives the Holy Spirit, who produces faith, where and when he will, in those who hear the Gospel, which teaches that we have a merciful God through the merits of Christ, not through our own merits, if we believe this."

"And the Anabaptists and others are condemned, who teach that we obtain the Holy Spirit without the external word of the Gospel, by our own preparation, thoughts and works."

We append, also, the text of the Article as preserved in the original German of Melanchthon, and in the cotemporeaneous Latin copy. The slight variation between them in the statement of the main topic of the Article, does not seriously affect the sense. Whilst the Latin intones the *means* by which the incumbent of the office is to accomplish its design, the German gives greater prominence to the fact that the office comes directly from God. No one can, however, for a moment suspect, that the Latin does not just as clearly *imply* the divine origin of the office, as the German copy *expresses* it.*

* The original German copy presents the article thus :

Solchen glauben zu erlangen, hat Gott das predigamt (typographical error in original, for predigamt,) eingesetzt, *Evangelium und Sacramenta geben*, dadurch, als durch mittel der heilig geist wirckt, und die Hertzen tröst und glauben gibt, wo und wenn er wil, inn denen, so das Evangelium hören, welches lehret, das wir, durch Christus verdienst ein gnedigen Gott haben, so wir solchs gleuben. Und wer-

As in the preceding article, the fundamental *doctrinal* error of Rome was effectually neutralised by the quiet, unimpassioned exhibition of the Scriptural doctrine of *Justification by Faith alone*—so in this article, as by a smooth stone from the brook, the giant, *practical* heresy of the hierarchy is smitten in the forehead by the simple annunciation of the *Scriptural theory of the Holy Ministry*. And we cannot but admire the calm and quiet style in which this thorough work is done. There is no denunciation of that monstrous iniquity, the hierarchical antichrist, under whose heel the Church was groaning. Still less is there a frenzied rushing to the other extreme of rejecting all ecclesiastical order and authority. But, with a spirit of profound submission to the truth, and of sublime confidence in its power to overthrow all error, there comes forth the simple statement, that God, [desiring to reconcile to himself the sinful race of man, and having, in pursuance of this gracious purpose, carried forward the wondrous plan of redemption even unto the sacrifice of his only begotten Son, there-upon] appointed and designated a special agency, namely, the *Ministry of Reconciliation, operating through the Word and the Sacraments, whereby he would ordinarily, in all coming time, apply to the hearts of men, with gracious and sovereign efficacy, upon the sole condition of faith upon their part, all the benefits of this atonement.*

The Confessors, in this statement, must be understood as having in view, on the one hand, the teachings of the Scriptures on this subject, and, on the other, the unscriptural,

den verdammet die Widderteuffer, und andere, so leren, das wir ohne das leibliche wort des Evangelii, den heiligen geist durch eigene bereitung und werck verdienien.

The original Latin copy presents the article thus :

Ut hanc fidem consequamur institutum est ministerium docendi evangelii et porrigi sacramenta. Nam per verbum et sacramenta tanquam per instrumenta donatur Spiritus Sanctus, qui fidem efficit, ubi et quando visum est Deo, in iis, qui audiunt Evangelium, scilicet quod Deus, non propter nostra merita sed propter Christum, justificet hos, qui credunt se propter Christum in gratiam recepi.

Damnam Anabaptistas et alios, qui sentiunt Spiritum Sanctum contingere sine verbo externo hominibus per ipsorum preparationes et opera.

and, therefore, unwarrantable claims of the Papacy to all manner of dignities and prerogatives as connected with the ministerial office. The article was equivalent to a solemn protest, on the part of the Confessors, against all else, as connected with the Gospel Ministry, except the simple preaching of the Gospel and the administration of the Sacraments. These are declared to be all sufficient under the sovereign sway of the Holy Spirit, to accomplish both the justification and the sanctification of the sincere believer. Silently, impliedly, but none the less decidedly, are here-with rebuked all claims on the part of a self-perpetuating, hierarchical, spiritual judiciary, that assumed to forgive sin by virtue of official authority vested in it. Equally decided on the other hand, is the specific protest against that false and fanatical spirituality that treats with neglect and contempt the outward Word of God, whilst relying upon its own inward preparation, thoughts and works. To nothing else, say the Confessors, is the reconciliation of the sinner with God to be ascribed, but to the blood of the atonement applied by the Holy Spirit, at his own good pleasure, to the hearts of all who truly believe.

We may well imagine how unwelcome such simple, Scriptural statements as these must have been to the imperious ecclesiastical tyrants before whom they were uttered. This article, thus reiterating the cardinal doctrine asserted in the one immediately preceding it, viz.: of Justification by Faith alone, and at the same time setting forth the office of the Ministry, as existing only for the purpose of awakening and keeping alive this faith, must have been recognized at once as a wholesale condemnation of everything in which the existing priesthood chiefly gloried.

Nor did the question as to the origin, nature, prerogatives, &c., of the ministerial office assume essentially any other shape during the succeeding age, when the various doctrines of the Confession were being more fully developed. The issue still remained the same, viz.: On the one hand, a simple, serving, Gospel Ministry, with the ordinary means of grace, made effectual by the Holy Spirit to the conversion and salvation of men; and, on the other, a domineering, hierarchical caste, claiming special official prerogatives and practically supplanting the divinely appointed means of grace by human inventions.

Upon this line the great battle of the Reformation was fought out, as far as this issue is concerned, and this now

constitutes one of the strongest contrasts between Evangelical and Papal Christianity, each party adhering to the principles and practice, the leading features of which are indicated in this article; *the Lutheran Ministry*, simply the divinely appointed official agency for the preaching of the Gospel and the administration of the Sacraments, with faith as the sole condition of justification before God; and the Romish priesthood, with all its various grades, a grand consolidated, self-perpetuating hierarchy, claiming to hold in its hands the keys of the kingdom of heaven, swaying an iron sceptre over the Church, imposing intolerable burdens of penance and bodily mortification, and demanding large pecuniary contributions as conditions *sine qua non*, for procuring pardon for sin and reconciliation with God.

So far, then, as the attitude of the Confession towards the Papal Church is concerned, and, we may add, towards the Episcopal Church also, (in so far as it clings to the unscriptural doctrine of a graded ministry and specially consecrated ministerial order, perpetuated in the Church by an uninterrupted personal and official succession from the apostles,)—so far as this aspect of the question is concerned, we leave it, with the simple statement we have made, as to the unvarying sameness of the issue, that we may turn to the consideration of certain topics intimately connected with the theme of this Article, that have been for some time past, and are now, agitating large portions of our Church, both in Europe and in this country.

Only upon two occasions, during the whole history of our Church, has the leading topic of this Article been the subject of serious controversy within our own communion. The first was consequent upon the glorious revival of the spirit of genuine Lutheranism, *i. e.*, of earnest evangelical Christianity, in the days of Spener and Francke. The letter of the standards then remained intact, it is true, but in many respects their spirit had been practically ignored. Theoretically adhering to the principles of the Reformers, the Church practically yielded in some measure to the pressure of circumstances, and, under the undue influence of the temporal power, encroachments upon the inherent rights of the laity were submitted to, and even apologized for, that provoked a reactionary resistance, when the heart of the Church was stirred and the current set in against the lifeless orthodoxy of the age. Along with other liv-

ing issues of that day was the question of the common priesthood of believers, the inherent right of the laity to expound the Scriptures and administer the Sacraments in time of need, and, the right and the duty of all believers to take an active part in the selection and appointment of the incumbents of the sacred office.*

Somewhat similar is the origin of the controversy at present agitating a portion of our Church, on this subject, and bidding fair to attract still greater attention.

The great revival of religion in our Churches upon the continent of Europe, consequent upon the devastating wars of Napoleon and the enthusiastic celebration of the tercentenary of the Reformation, in 1817, led many, whose hearts were turned to the Lord, to give earnest heed also to the teachings of the great theologians of our Church; and the newly awakened religious zeal and thirst for sound and wholesome religious instruction awakened in the hearts of multitudes of the people a just contempt for the heartless rationalism of those whom they were compelled to receive as their religious teachers. Finding themselves authorized, both by the Word of God and the standards of the Church, to exercise the right of choosing pastors for themselves, and unable, in conscience, to submit to the imposition of unworthy ministers, they resisted "the powers that be" and willingly endured the consequent persecution for the sake of Christ and a free Gospel. The issue, thus created, led at once to an earnest discussion of the great principles involved in it, calling forth some admirable dissertations and provoking, unfortunately, a warm and even angry controversy, in which some of the leading theologians of Germany participated. Meanwhile, some of those of whom we have spoke as persecuted for conscience sake emigrating to this country, found here free scope for the exercise of all their religious rights, and one would naturally expect that, so far as they are concerned, the agitation upon this question would cease. And this would probably have been the case, had they not been harshly called to account for their opinions and practices in this matter by some of their countrymen of more conservative views. In consequence of this a controversy has arisen that has

* See some account of this controversy between Spener, Freylingenhausen, Frohn, Eilmar, Köpke and others, in Walch's *Religious-Streitigkeiten*, I, 562 sq., 814 sq., II, 492, &c.

unfortunately been conducted in a spirit far from creditable to either party.

It would be difficult to account for the vehemence and acrimony exhibited in this controversy, were it not for the fact that the respective parties believe that they see lurking in the statements of their opponents the embryos of dangerous heresies; and so they feel called upon, respectively, not merely to dispute one another's avowed opinions, but also what seem to be erroneous tendencies likely to be developed by them.

Whilst we cannot but regret the unbecoming temper in which this discussion has, especially of late, been conducted, we cannot refrain from expressing our gratitude to the respective combatants for the industry and zeal with which they have sifted out of the huge mass of our early Church literature and placed within our easy reach everything that bears upon this question, each party seeking to entrench itself behind ecclesiastical authority, and each in fact finding what it claims to be a vindication of its views in the public standards of the Church and in the writings of our soundest theologians.*

The parties in this controversy may be characterized as the democratic-republican on the one hand, and the aristocratic-conservative upon the other. Of these, the former represents the radical revolutionary element of the Reformation period, with its downright and outspoken antagonism to the hierarchy of the age; whilst the latter exhibits rather the spirit and reflects the views of a later era, when, in a more settled state of affairs, the opinions and practice of the Church had fallen back somewhat from the more pronounced position of the radical Reformers. The former, starting out with the assertion of the right of all believers to choose and ordain their own religious teachers, were driven in the heat of controversy to such assertions concerning the constant actual right of all Christians personally to administer the functions of the ministerial office, as led their opponents to charge them with low and agrarian views of the Sacred Ministry, that rob it of all dignity and authority. The latter, seeming to insist upon the self-perpetuating character of the Ministry, are charged by their

* Our special acknowledgments are due to Doctors Walther and Höfling for many of the extracts from our older theologians of which we avail ourselves in this article.

opponents with a Rome-ward tendency, as though they made the Church the child of the Ministry and dependent upon a hierachial caste.*

Now it seems strange that among those who claim to hold with equal tenacity not only to the Scriptures but also to the Confessions of our Church, there should be such widely different views upon a subject so clearly stated in the standards and so abundantly illustrated in the writings of our leading theologians. Surely this should teach these controversialists to regard with greater charity their brethren in the faith, who, agreeing with them so cordially on all the great leading issues of the Reformation period, conscientiously differ from them upon some topics of far less importance than those here in dispute.

Let us now turn to the original documents and endeavor to ascertain from them *what the Confessors understood to be the Source and the Prerogatives of the Gospel Ministry, and its Relation to the Church as a whole.*

In endeavoring to fix with precision the meaning they attached to the terms Priesthood, Office, Call, Keys, &c., we are unfortunately met at the threshold, with the fact that the Reformers (and, among them all, especially Luther), employed these expressions often in a vague and variable sense, rendering their utterances, at different times, more or less inconsistent, thus affording an opportunity for those, who differ from one another in their views

* Among those of the former class, who have taken part in this controversy, we may mention Höfling, (Grundsätze evangelisch-lutherischer Kirchen verfassung, Erlangen, 1853), Harless, (Kirche und Amt nach lutherischer Lehre, Stuttgart, 1853); Walther, (Die Stimme unserer Kirche in der Frage von Kirche und Amt, Erlangen, 1852; the same writer in the Lutheraner of 1860, &c.); Loy, in the Evangelical Review, 1861, 1864; Eirich, ditto, 1860; Fink, ditto, 1861; Fritschel, S. F. in Brobst's Theologische Monatshefte, 1869.

Of those advocating the later, more conservative views, which have generally prevailed in our Church, both in Europe and this country, we call attention to Löhe, (Aphorismen ueber die neutestamentlichen Aemter und ihr Verhaeltniss zur Gemeinde, Erlangen, 1849; also Kirche und Amt—Neue Aphorismen, Erlangen, 1851); Grabau, in the Pastoral-briefe of the Buffalo Synod and in the Informatiorium; Worley, in the Evangelical Review, 1860; Hinterleitner, in Brobst's Theologische Monatshefte, 1869; Mohlidenke, ditto, 1870; Münchmeyer, Guericke, Thomasius, Kahnis, Delitsch, Kliesth, &c.

upon this subject, from both sides to appeal to them for sanction and authority. Hence it has resulted that the present controversy is to a great extent a mere logomachy. If these and kindred terms were precisely defined and the respective parties would agree to use them *in the same sense*, more carefully noting the varying phases of thought expressed by them at different times, by the same early writers, those who now so bitterly denounce each other would probably be found, after all, not to be so very wide apart.

Fortunately, on the other hand, we are not confined to the Confession itself in our search after the precise views of the Confessors upon this subject. Not only are we justified, upon general grounds, in appealing to the other writings published by those who are mainly responsible for the Confession itself, in illustration of their opinions, but these other writings are directly referred to in the standards as rendering a fuller statement upon these subjects unnecessary.

At the same time, we should not forget to make due allowance also in interpreting the *Augustana*, for the unmistakable influence of the mild and gentle, and we may add the conservative and conciliatory, spirit of Melanchthon in imparting to it an irenic character that it assuredly would not have borne had the true master spirit of the Reformation given it its final shape and form. *Ich hætte nicht so leise treten können*, was Luther's characteristic remark when he first read it, leaving us to infer that he would have planted his foot down more firmly, in more than one place, and that we should then have had a more radical and thoroughly outspoken anti-Romish document, as the great standard Confession of Protestantism, than we now have.

I. *The Gospel Ministry*, say the Confessors, is a divinely appointed office. This is so distinctly stated in the Article itself, "God has instituted the office of the Ministry," that it hardly seems necessary to look elsewhere in the other writings of its authors, for a confirmation of this statement.

Now, whilst the office of religious teacher would probably have arisen in the Christian Church even without any special divine appointment, as a practical necessity, just as we find that something analogous to it has existed among all heathen nations, yet we are not left to account for its

origin in the Church upon any such grounds. As our Confessors here teach, it was directly introduced, and ordered to be perpetuated, by the Lord himself. Matt. 28 : 19, 20, Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, &c. 2 Cor. 5 : 18, He hath given unto us the ministry of reconciliation. Eph. 4 : 11, And he gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers. In 20 : 21, As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you.

It may be satisfactory, nevertheless, to hear a few of the utterances of the Reformers upon this subject, and their echo in the writings of some of our leading theologians.

Luther, in 1522, Walsh, XIX, 1834.

"Paul says to his disciple Titus, 1 : 5—7, For this cause left I thee in Crete, that thou shouldst set in order the things that are wanting and ordain elders in every city, as I had appointed thee, &c. Whoever believes that here the Spirit of Christ is speaking and commanding through Paul, he must acknowledge that *this is a divine appointment and arrangement*, that in every city there must be many bishops, or at least one."

Luther, in the Smalcald Articles, 1587.

"The office of the Ministry is consequent upon the calling of the apostles."

Luther, in 1530, Walsh, X, 488.

"I hope indeed that believers, and those who wish to be called Christians, know very well that *the Ministry has been appointed and established by God*, not with gold and silver but with the precious blood and bitter death of his only Son, our Lord Jesus Christ."

The term *appointed*, (*eingesetzt, institutum est*,) which the Confessors here use in regard to the Ministry, is employed by them also in regard to human government, (Art. XVI,) and they plainly understand the relation to be the same in both cases. That there shall be some form of government among men, God has determined; what precise shape it shall assume, he has not definitely prescribed. That this authority, when exercising its functions justly and righteously, is to be obeyed, he has commanded, "Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God," Rom. 13 : 1. So also, in the Church, with the Gospel Ministry. "Obey them that have the rule over you, who watch for your souls as they that must give an account."

Melanchthon, in the *Apology*, XII, 11.

"The Ministry of the Gospel has the command of God and has magnificent promises, Rom. 1: 16; Is. 55: 11."

Melanchthon, in the *Apology*, XIV, 12.

"The Church is commanded to appoint ministers, which ought to be most gratifying to us, because we know that God approves that Ministry and is present with it."

Gerhard, *Loc. de Minist. Eccl.* §§ 8 & 49.

"The necessity of the ministerial office depends upon the divine appointment, for it has pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe, 1 Cor. 1: 21, &c."

"*The original efficient cause of the Gospel Ministry is the one and only true God, Father, Son and Holy Ghost*, which is proved: 1. By the express declarations of the Scriptures, Ps. 68: 12; 1 Cor. 12: 28; 2 Cor. 5: 18, "God hath given to us, apostles and other teachers of the Church, the ministry of reconciliation. 2. By the liberal promises of God, that he would give pastors to his Church and would perpetuate the office of preaching, Jer. 3: 15; 23: 4, And I will set up shepherds over them (τίκτειν, cause to stand, appoint) which shall feed them. Joel 2: 28. 3. By the peculiar titles of God, which prove that the appointment and preservation of the ministerial office belongs to him, Matt. 9: 38, &c.

Chemnitz, *Exam. XII, de sacr. ord.* p. 579.

"That the office of the Word and the Sacraments was instituted by the Son of God also in the New Testament cannot be doubted. *The Church has also the command to call and appoint servants*, and 1. The promise is added that God will approve the appointment of those who are called by the voice of the Church and set apart for this office. Thus Paul says, *Acts 20: 28*, that those who are called *mediately* are appointed by the Holy Ghost to feed the flock of God. And in *Eph. 4: 11*, it is written that the Son of God grants as his gifts not only *apostles* but also *pastors* and *teachers*, who are called *mediately*. 2. The promise is added that God will grant his grace and gifts, so that those who are legitimately called may, by the use of the same, rightly, faithfully and savingly accomplish what is designed by the sacred office; *John 20: 23; Matt. 28: 20; 1 Tim. 4: 14, &c.* 3. This promise also is added, that God will be with the office, will bless the planting and watering

and make them successful, will effectually work through the office, calling, enlightening, converting, granting repentance, faith, regeneration, reformation, and in short accomplishing through the office the entire work of salvation. Matt. 28: 20; John 20: 23; Matt. 16: 19; 2 Cor. 3: 6, &c."

As we have already intimated, the Confessors held that

II. *The chief design and special duty of the Ministerial Office is the preaching of the Gospel, the administration of the Sacraments, and the exercise of Church discipline.*

Whilst in the Article before us, only the preaching of the Gospel and the administration of the Sacraments are mentioned, the third duty we have here added is throughout implied, as it is generally expressly mentioned, by the Confessors and all the early theologians, when describing the functions of the Ministerial Office. This will abundantly appear in what follows; and we only add here, to avoid misapprehension, that we are never to understand the Confessors when using the phrase, "forgive and retain sin," that as employing it in a Romish sense. For it will be recollect that the Reformation had its very birth in Luther's thundering theses against the blasphemous presumption of that abomination of the Papacy.

Augsburg Confession, Abuses Corrected, VII, 5.

"Our Churches hold, that the power of the Keys, or the power of the bishops, according to the Gospel, is the authorization or command of God to preach the Gospel, to forgive and retain sin, and administer the Sacraments. For with this command Christ sent forth the Apostles, John 20: 21; Mark 16: 15. *This power is exercised in teaching or preaching the Word, and administering the Sacraments, to many or few according to the call, because not corporeal but eternal things are dispensed, eternal justice, the Holy Spirit, eternal life; and these things could not be done except through the ministration of the Word and the Sacraments.*"

Smalcald Articles; Appendix.

"In our Apology we have in general described what is the nature of ecclesiastical authority. For the Gospel commands all who are placed over the Churches that they preach the Gospel, forgive sins, and administer the Sacraments; and besides this it gives to them such jurisdiction that they are to excommunicate those who continue in open vice, and to release and absolve those who wish to

reform. Now all must confess, even our opponents, that all who are set over the Churches have this command alike, whether they be called Pastors, or Presbyters, or Bishops.¹⁹

III. *The Ministry is no self-perpetuating caste or order, with rights and duties intrinsically different from those of all other believers; for all true believers are spiritual priests and are capable of performing all the functions of the ministerial office, if called thereto, or, in case of special necessity, even without a regular call.*

Surely those altogether misunderstand the Confessors who suppose that they meant by this Article to teach that God, when he appointed the *Ministerial Office*, gave to it the Gospel and the Sacraments and the Keys in such a sense as that, by possessing the sole and exclusive right to administer the same, they should constitute a superior rank in the Church and hand down these prerogatives to their successors in office. They not only do not imply this, but they elsewhere distinctly assert the contrary, viz.: That God gave the Gospel, and the Sacraments, and the power of the Keys besides, to all the Church, to the whole body of believers. It would be strange, indeed, if those just emerging from the thralldom of the hierarchy, and in the very act of protesting against its enormous assumptions in this direction, should so stultify themselves as practically to give back, into the hands of an official, self-perpetuating caste, the very weapons with which the Church had so long been held in subjection! No, they held that there is no such difference between the regularly called Ministry and the mass of the believers that the latter cannot perform any of the functions of the Ministerial Office in case of necessity. But this could not be the case if the mass of believers were not already possessed of the essential qualifications for the discharge of these official duties, and if the right of performing them, or of having them performed, were not originally vested in all the individual members of the Church.

Luther, in 1521, Walch XIX, 1340, 1341.

"It is enough that we know that a Christian people is not divided but is without sects or respect of person, in which there is no layman, no clergy, no monk, no nun, absolutely no difference, all married or unmarried as any one may choose. There is in reality no difference between the bishops, elders and priests and the laity, no one being distinguished from other Christians *except that he has an office*,

which is committed to him, to preach the Word of God and to administer the Sacraments; just as a mayor or judge is in no wise distinguished from the other citizens, except that the government of the city is entrusted to him. * * The name bishop or priest is not the name of a *class*, but of an *office*; priest is the same as elder, and bishop the same as overseer. Yet wicked men have manufactured out of them *ranks* and special dignity."

Luther, in his Commentary on 1 Peter, (in 1528,) writes thus:

"Now these [Papists] have established *an order*, as though it were appointed by God, and have taken such liberties in the very midst of Christendom that there is a greater difference than between us and the Turks."

There is a twofold scriptural basis upon which the Confessors rest these opinions, viz.: *The common priesthood of believers and the power of the Keys.*

Luther, Exposition of 110th Psalm, in 1539.

"Do you ask, wherein consists the priesthood of believers, or what are their priestly works? Answer:—The very same of which we have been speaking, namely, teaching, sacrificing and praying. If we have become Christians, * * then we have also received the right and the power to teach and confess the Word that He gives us before all, *every one according to his calling and place*. For, although we do not all occupy a public office and calling yet every believer *may and should* teach, instruct, exhort, comfort, rebuke his neighbor through the Word of God, whenever and wherever that may be needed, as a father and mother their children and household, one brother, or neighbor, citizen or farmer, the other."

This is what *Luther* means by private Christians *using the office*, viz.: Acting as priest in a private capacity, not officiating in public.

Luther, in 1538, Winkelmesse, Walch XIX, 1536.

"We do not wish to be, or to be called, *made* but *born* priests, and our priesthood we claim as hereditary from our father and mother; for *our Father* is the true Pastor and High Priest, as is written in the 110th Psalm: God has sworn and will not repent, Thou art a priest forever after the order of Melchizedek. And that he has verified in that he offered himself for us upon the cross, &c. But this same Priest has a *Bride*, a priestess, as is written, John 3: 29, He that hath the bride is the bridegroom. Of this

bridegroom and bride we are born through holy baptism and so have become hereditarily true priests in Christendom, sanctified by his blood and consecrated by his Holy Spirit, as St. Peter calls us, 1 Peter 2:5, Ye are a holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, and St. Paul, Rom. 12:2, also calls us *priests*, for he exhorts us to "present our bodies as a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God." Now to sacrifice unto God is the office of the priest alone, as the Pope himself must confess, and all the world beside. Moreover we are not only his *children*, but also his *brothers*, as he says, Ps. 22:23, I will declare thy name unto my *brethren*; and Matt. 12:50, He that doeth the will of my Father, the same is my mother, sister, brother. So that *we are priests by the double title of childhood and brotherhood*. This our connate and inherited priesthood we insist shall not be taken from us, or interfered with or eclipsed, but held prominently forth, proclaimed and abundantly honored, so that it may shine resplendently as the sun, and dazzle the eyes of the devil and his abominable puppets, so that his sneaking masses and chrism, in contrast to it, shall stink worse than devils-dung. Hence the Holy Ghost in the New Testament has taken especial care that the name priest (*Sacerdos*) should not be applied to any apostle or to any other offices, but only to the baptized or Christians, as a connate, inherited name through baptism."

The point is much insisted upon by our earlier writers, that the term *priest*, which in the course of time came to carry with it so much of special prerogative, was the common appellation of all believers in the days of primitive Christianity.

Joh. Gerhard, Loc. de Min. Eccl. §§ 14, 15.

"Augustine, (de Civit. Dei, 10,) says: *Now in the Church only the bishops and elders are called priests, but all Christians were so called in view of the mysterious anointing, because they are all members of one Priest.*" "The former signification (says Joh. Gerhard,) is the *ecclesiastical* one, the latter is the one usually *employed in the Scriptures*, this is specially to be noted, as against the Papists who seek to derive an argument in favor of the mass from the name priest as applied in the writings of the Church Fathers to the office bearers of the New Testament."

Luther, Kirchenpostille, Walch, XII, 1889.

"They must confess [the Papists] that this typical priest-

hood, which existed under the Old Testament, exists no longer, and we ask them then, whence have they authority to say that they were typified by those priests, and that they alone are priests of the New Testament? There is not a letter in the whole New Testament in which they are called priests. What can they say to this? The lepers are to go to the priests; where are the priests? St. Peter, 1 Ep. 2:9, says that in the New Testament there are no special priests, but that all *Christians* are priests, typified by those priests."

Luther, Sendschreiben-Prag, 1523, Walch, X, 1834.

"For a priest, especially in the New Testament must be born, not made; is not consecrated but created; is not born, however, by a carnal birth, but by a spiritual birth through the Word and Spirit, in the washing of regeneration. So that all Christians are together priests, and all priests are Christians, and it is a cursed abuse of language to say that a priest is anything else than a Christian, for that is maintained in despite of the Word of God, only as a doctrine of men, or as a matter of tradition, or because many believe it. And to make either of these three reasons the basis of a matter of faith, is blasphemous and abominable."

Melanchthon, in the Apology.

"Gabriel, among other reasons for withholding the cup from the laity, adds this also, that there must be a difference between the priests and the laity. And I suppose that is the principal reason why they now insist so much upon this, so as to give a greater air of holiness to the clergy in contrast with the laity. This is all a human contrivance; it is easy to see what is the drift of it."

Heshusius, Hauptartikel christl. Lehre A. D., 1584, p. 785.

"All believers, not only those who are in the holy office, but also civil rulers and mechanics, who are baptized in the name of Christ and regenerated by the Holy Spirit, these are priests and priestesses, that are fully entitled to offer spiritual sacrifices. The Apostle Peter addresses not only preachers, bishops and pastors, but the whole Church of God, those who had received the Word of God and faith in Christ, these he calls the royal priesthood; therefore the Pope with his bishops does wrong, in that he robs the Church of God of her title of honor and appropriates this glorious name entirely to himself and his baldheaded crowd."

We have already remarked that some of the technical terms of this controversy were used by the Reformers and the early theologians of our Church *in a vague and variable manner*. This is particularly true of the term *Keys*. In its strict sense, of the "power of binding and loosing," they all employ it; but they often use it also in a much wider sense; as will be seen from a few quotations.

Art. XXVIII, of the Confession, defines the keys to be: "An authority and command of God to preach the Gospel, to forgive and retain sin, and to dispense the Sacraments. This power of the keys we employ and exert only by *teaching and preaching the Word of God* and by administering the Sacrament to many or few persons, according as our call may be," &c.

Melanchthon, Smalcald Articles, Appendix.

"Just as the promise of the Gospel belongs immediately to the whole Church so also do the keys belong immediately to the whole Church; since the *keys* are nothing else than the office through which that promise is imparted to every one who desires it."

Luther, in 1521, commenting upon Matt. 18:15—20, Büchlein von der Beichte, Erlangen Ed. 27:363—4, says: "O that this passage were not in the Gospel! What a fine thing that would be for the Pope! For here Christ gives the keys to the whole Church and not to St. Peter. And here belongs also the same saying, Matt. 16:18, 19, where he gives the keys to Peter on behalf of the whole Church. For in this 18th chapter the Lord makes a gloss upon his own words, showing to whom he had previously (Matt. 16,) given the keys, in the person of St. Peter. They are given to *all Christians* and not to the person, St. Peter."

Luther, in 1523, Sendschr. Prag, Walch X, 1846.

"The keys belong to the whole congregation of Christians and to every one that is a member thereof, and this not only so far as the possession of the power is concerned, but also as to its actual use in every way possible, so that we do no violence to the words of Christ, who says bluntly and to all alike: Let him be *unto thee* as a heathen man and a publican, Matt. 18:17, * * Also; 19, If two of you shall agree on earth, also, v. 20, "Where two or three are gathered together in my name there am I in the midst of them." Also, "Whatsoever ye shall bind," &c. And here I would use in proof also that passage in which Christ ad-

dressed Peter alone: *To thee will I give the keys of the kingdom of heaven.* In which texts the most perfect authority and the exercise of it for binding and loosing are assured and confirmed most positively. Unless, indeed, we would deny to Christ himself the power and use of the keys if he dwelt with the two or three."

Luther, in 1589, *Schrift von Conciliis und Kirchen*, Walch XVI, 2791.

"The keys are not the Pope's (as he falsely claims) but the Church's; that is they belong to the people of Christ, the people of God, or the holy Christian people, all the world over, or where there are Christians. For they cannot all be at Rome, or the whole world would have to be there, which will not happen for some time to come. Just as baptism, the sacrament, God's Word, are not the Pope's but belong to the people of Christ, so the keys are and are called *claves ecclesiae*, not *claves papae*."

Melanchthon, Smalcald Articles, append. 22 sq.

"And here they quote against us several texts; *e. g.*, Matt. 16, Thou art Peter and upon this rock will I build my Church. Also, *to thee will I give the keys*. Also, feed my sheep. And more of the same kind. But, as this whole matter has been diligently and sufficiently treated of by those of our side we will not here repeat what they have written, but will now briefly reply as to what is the real meaning of those passages. *In all these texts Peter is a representative person*, and speaks not for himself alone, but for all the apostles. This the passages clearly prove, for Christ *always asks not Peter alone*, but says: Whom do *ye* say that I am? And, although he says in one place to *Peter* alone: *To thee will I give the keys*; and, *Whatsoever thou bindest, &c.*; yet he says the very same in other places to *all the disciples*: *Whatsoever ye shall bind, &c.*, Matt. 18. Also, in John: *Whosoever sins ye remit, &c.* These words prove that the keys were given to all alike, and that they all alike were sent forth to preach."

"But, over and above all this, we are to confess that the keys belong and have been given not to one man alone, but to the *whole Church*, as this can be clearly and satisfactorily proven. *For just as the promise of the Gospel belongs to the whole Church, originally and immediately, so also do the keys belong to the whole Church immediately*, for the keys are nothing else than the office through which those promises are communicated to every one who de-

sires them; as it is factually evident to all that the Church has the power to appoint her ministers. And Christ, along with these words: Whatsoever ye shall bind, &c., clearly indicates to whom he has given the keys, namely, to the whole Church, when he says: Wheresoever two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them."

At this point we meet one of the principal topics now in controversy. In direct opposition to this last statement of Luther, in the Smalcald Articles, that the whole Church, and every member of it, has received the keys *originally and immediately*, the conservative party assert, in the words of Grabau: (Informatorium, second year, page 23) "The congregation [Church] has the keys *not immediately*, but *mediately in the Word of God and in the holy office of the ministry.*"

(First year, page 22): "If it now be said that this special ecclesiastical authority is given by Christ to his Church upon earth, nothing more is intended than that it was instituted in the Gospel and set up in the Church by ordinary means through the efficacy of the Gospel in the form of the office of bishop or preacher."

"In this house of God now there are the keys of Christ through means of the Gospel and the office of the ministry, not because they have their origin there, but because that is the appropriate spiritual theatre where they can exhibit their power for the consolation and salvation of souls and be thus put to use. And in this sense the Smalcald Articles say that the keys are given to the whole Church."

That our earlier theologians did not so understand the Smalcald Articles, but held this to be the Romish view of the Ministry, is apparent, e. g., from Gerhard's statement: (Loc. Theol. de Min., § 87.)

"It is a jesuitical evasion to say that the Church has the keys only in so far as they are handled in her midst by her ministers. Bellarmin makes the objection: 'Peter received the keys on behalf of the Church, because he received them for the use and profit of the whole Church, and because he was not only to use them himself, but also to hand them down to his successors and impart them to all bishops and priests.' Answer: We admit that Peter received the keys for the use and profit of the Church, and holds them in common with other bishops and pastors, but we deny that

this is to be understood exclusively, as if the keys were given to Peter and the bishops alone, and not to the whole Church. For, as Peter confessed Christ *on behalf of the Church*, not alone in the sense that that confession availed for the *profit* of the whole Church, but also *because in the confessing Peter the Church herself confessed*: thus also the keys of the kingdom of heaven were given to Peter on behalf of the Church, not only because they were given to him for the *profit and use* of the whole Church, but also because the Church, in the person of Peter, received them, so that she herself should participate in the *use of the same*, as well in other matters embraced under the name of the power of the keys as also in the *election and calling of well qualified ministers of the Word.*"

In further illustration of the above statement we present the following from the celebrated Evangelical Harmony of Chemnitz, Leyser and Gerhard. In their exposition of Matt. 16 : 19, they say :

"First of all we are to inquire what is to be understood by the keys of the kingdom of heaven which Christ here, (Matt. 16 : 19) promises. Let us call to mind the fact that Christ, in this conversation with his disciples, has been comparing his Church to a city, or to a house which he himself is building. And indeed the Church is his city, in which he gathers the citizens and subjects of his kingdom, and his house in which he has deposited all his goods and treasures, viz.: The grace of God, forgiveness of sins, justification, salvation, &c. The handing over of the keys is of old the symbol of a specific, entrusted, transferred authority ; for, he who has the keys has access to all. If, e. g., a man gives to his wife the keys, he declares thereby that he acknowledges her as his associate, and entrusts her with the care of the household. So also are the keys entrusted to householders and stewards by their masters, whereby authority is given to them over chambers, cellars, chests and whatever is contained therein. And so, when *princes* are admitted to a city, the keys of the same are handed over to them by the citizens, in token of their submission to their authority and in acknowledgment of their authority to admit any one into the city, or exclude him from it. This figure our Lord here applies to the *Church*, whose keys he entrusts to Peter and his associates *in office*, whereby he teaches that he means to appoint them as his stewards and householders, that they are to open the treas-

ures to the worthy and admit them to the possession and use of the same, but to close them up against the unworthy and unholy and to exclude these from the kingdom of God. 1 Cor. 4 : 1. The phrase : "Keys of the kingdom of heaven," comprises therefore that function, power and plenary authority in virtue of which everything is performed that is necessary for the kingdom of Christ, or the government of the Church. And this could not be more appropriately explained than by this figure of the keys."

"Nevertheless the right of every Christian to the keys, even of the most obscure, which he has been entrusted with by Christ, remains inviolate. For, as all the citizens of a free city of the empire, however large their number may be, have common rights and equal freedom, so far as the republic is concerned; and as, for the sake of order, they elect senators and appoint a mayor to preside over them, to whom they commit the keys and statutes of the city, so that he may administer the same in the common name of all, and govern the republic accordingly, just so do the people of the city of God. They have indeed a communion of saints, and all is theirs, whether Paul or Peter, life or death, the present or the future; 1 Cor. 3 : 21; they possess all things under the one Head, Christ, who has purchased by the merits of his blood everything necessary to salvation for his Church, and in this especially for every member, even the most obscure; and yet, for the sake of order, they elect certain persons to whom THEY COMMIT the administration [or use] of the keys of the kingdom of heaven; these are those who among us are called deacons, pastors, doctors, bishops, or superintendents, &c., so that everything may be done among us decently and in order, according to the teachings of St. Paul, 1 Cor. 14."

IV. Although the Confessors held such clear and decided views in regard to the essential equality of all believers, as over against the claims of a hierarchical caste, yet *they did not understand our Savior as conferring upon all alike the right ordinarily and publicly to perform the functions of the ministerial office.*

They declare, Art. XIV: "No one dare publicly teach or preach, or administer the sacraments, unless he be rightly called."

For which *Hutter* assigns the following reasons :

1. "On account of the command of God, Jer. 23 : 31; Heb. 5 : 4; Rom. 10 : 15.

2. For the sake of *ordian* (good order) and the tranquility of the Church, 1 Cor. 14 : 40.
3. For certainty of doctrine ; for, that it may surely be known what this is, and by whom it is received, there is need of doctrinal investigation and of testimonies.
4. On account of the conscience of the teacher, that he may be certain that the grace of Christ is with him and that his hearers also may know that they are listening to an ambassador of God, 2 Cor. 5 : 20."

Luther was charged by Emser with teaching that the general priesthood made all to be preachers, &c. ; to whom he replied, (in 1521) "And so you lie when you say that I have made all laymen bishops, priests and ecclesiastics, so that they may at once, *uncalled*, assume the office ; you do not add, pious as you are, that I also wrote : Only *extreme necessity* can justify one in doing that to which he has not been regularly called." (Walch XVII, 1597.)

Luther, in 1520, (Letter to Germ. Nob. Walch X, 302.)

"If we now be all priests alike, then no one is to put himself forward and undertake, without our consent and choice, to do that which we all have the same authority to do. For what is common to all, that no one dare appropriate to himself without the common consent and command. And if it should happen that some one is chosen for such an office, and for his bad conduct is deposed, then he becomes just what he was before. For the position of a priest, in the Church, is just like that of a civil officer ; whilst he is in office he has precedence ; but when he is deposed he is a farmer or a citizen just like the rest."

Luther, in 1523, (com. on 1 Peter.)

"Now you may say, if that be true, that we are all priests, and are to preach, what will be the state of affairs ? Is there to be no difference among the people ? Are the women, too, to be priests ? Answer : Those who are now called priests were all laymen, as the rest, and have only been chosen as officials by the Church. The difference, therefore, is only outwardly, in virtue of the office, to which one has been called by the Church ; but before God there is no difference. And some are put forward from the mass only for this reason that, in the place of the congregation, they may perform the functions of the office that belongs to all, not that one may have more power than another. *Therefore no one should come forward of his own accord and preach in the congregation, but one is to be*

called forth from the mass and appointed, who may be deposed again, if it be thought proper."

How these expressions of the Confession and of Luther were subsequently understood, is manifest from such statements as the following, from *Gerhard*, (Loc. Theol. de Sacr. § 29, and de Min. Eccl. § 67):

"So far as Luther is concerned, *he does not concede to all that are baptized the unconditional and absolute right to administer the sacraments*, but he speaks of a certain general fitness (aptitudine) which Christians possess, as distinguished from unbelievers, because, having been received through baptism into the covenant of God, they are fit and suited for this office, if, namely, they be legitimately called to it."

"Believers are called *kings*; but it does not therefore follow that every believer can exercise the office of the civil authority, without a call thereto, for the Apostles speak of *spiritual kings*; and just so, because believers are called *priests*, it does not therefore follow that every one can without a call assume an ecclesiastical office, for the Apostles in like manner speak of *spiritual priests*. For they are called spiritual priests *not with reference to an ecclesiastical office*, but with reference to the spiritual sacrifices which they are to offer to God. Nor has the objection any force when in it we are told that Peter adds that believers are a royal priesthood, that ye should show forth the praises of him who hath called you out of darkness into his marvellous light, for we must distinguish between the *general command and calling*, which all Christians receive, along with their consecration as believers, and the *special call* through which the administration of the office of the Word and Sacraments in the *public assemblies of the Church* is committed by common consent to certain persons well qualified for the same; but, that this call is not common to all Christians, is evident from 1 Cor. 12: 29; Eph. 4: 11; Jas. 3: 1."

Chemnitz, (Exam. c. 85, p. 1687):

"Christ gave the keys of the kingdom of heaven to the Church, Matt. 18: 18. And we give ourselves no concern here about the ridicule of those who cry out: 'Then cobblers and tailors, cooks and day-laborers have the power of the keys, and thus you build your own Babel and introduce endless confusion.' I answer: who will deny that in case of need every believer may baptize &c.? And this

case of extreme necessity the Church has always made an exception, as Jerome has testified, against the Luciferians, and Augustine against Fortunatus. But, except in case of necessity this is allowed to no one, unless he be a regularly called and appointed servant of the Church. For this would be to violate the divine rule: how can they preach except they be sent? Rom. 10:15. Again, they ran and I did not send them."

Henricus Barnerus, (Abriss d. neuen Menschen. p. 374.)

"That they [i. e., Christians] do not all publicly administer the office of teaching, *in publico ministerio*, is owing to the fact that they have not been thereto called, *vocationis defectus*. Here we must distinguish between rank and office, *inter statum et officium*. To the *office* belongs a special call, *specialis vocatio*, which must be committed, entrusted. But this is not the case with the *rank*. Thus all Christians are priests but not all are pastors, for this one can only be if, besides being a Christian and a priest he has an office and parish entrusted to him."

Chemnitz, (Exam. II. de S. ord. c. 1):

"All Christians are indeed priests, 1 Peter 2, Rev. 1, for they offer to God spiritual sacrifices; every one has both the right and the duty to teach the Word of God in his own house, Deut. 6:1; 1 Cor. 14. But not every Christian dare assume the *public office* of the Word and Sacraments. For not all are apostles, not all are teachers, 1 Cor. 12, but only those who by a special and legitimate call are set apart for this office by God himself, Acts 13; Jer. 23; Rom. 10; and this is done either mediately or immediately."

Salamon Deyling, (Inst. Prud. Past. p. 403):

"As the right of teaching and of administering the sacraments belongs *originally* (der Wurzel nach) to the *whole Church*, but the *public exercise* of the same only to its legitimately called *servants*; so every *member* of the *Church*, just the same as the *whole coetus* (congregation) possesses the *keys* in the same manner as the authority to teach, but only for *private use*, not for *public* and *stated use*, lest there should arise confusion that would miserably rend the *Church*. In the *public congregation* the *keys* are to be used only by those to whom the *whole Church* has transferred their *exercise* and *use* by a *public call*."

V. And now the next question that presents itself is: *How is this office to be filled?* Where lies the authority to select and set apart those who are to perform its functions?

To this *Luther* answers (Walch X, 2547):

"The call to the Gospel Ministry is of two kinds, the one coming *directly from God*. The other *through men* and yet also *just as truly from God*. The first we are not to credit unless it be demonstrated by miracles, such as were performed by Christ and his Apostles. Some were called not by men, *nor through a man*, but were chosen by Jesus Christ and God the Father, such as the prophets and all the apostles. Others were chosen indeed by God, but *through men*, as the disciples of the apostles and all who rightly enter the holy office instead of the apostles until the end of the world."

But this mediate call, *through men*, by whom is it to be exercised? By the Ministry alone, or by the Church, as a whole?

Calovius, (Syst. loc. th. Tom. VIII, p. 334):

"It is known that the *right to call* has been entrusted to the Church, just as the keys and church discipline, Matt. 18: 18; 1 Cor. 3: 21; 4: 1; Rom. 3: 2; 9: 4; 1 Cor. 5: 1 sq. The Church however has not transferred this to the presbytery alone, but exercises it directly herself and by the cooperation of all her constituent parts."

Smalcald Articles, 67.

"Wheresoever the Church is, there is also the right of administering the Gospel. Wherefore it is necessary for the Church to retain the *right of calling, electing and ordaining ministers*. And this right is a special gift bestowed upon the Church of which no human authority can deprive her."

Hollazius, (quoted in Schmid's Dogmatik, p. 478, 8d ed.):

"Through the divine call is here understood the appointment of a certain and suitable person to the ecclesiastical office with the right to teach in public, to administer the sacraments, and exercise ecclesiastical discipline, effected by God, either alone or by intervention of a human instrumentality."

Gerhard, (XII, 75, in Schmid's Dgm. 478):

"The difference between the *mediate* and *immediate* call consists always and only in this that the former is effected through ordinary means, divinely appointed for this purpose, but the latter through God himself, who manifests his will concerning the immediate call of each person either by direct personal interference or through some representative."

The *mediate* call is, therefore, none the less to be considered divine: For, (*Gerhard*, XII, 79)

"1. It is referred to God as its author, Ps. 68: 12; Is. 41: 27; Jer. 8: 15; 28: 4; 1 Cor. 12: 38; Eph. 4: 11.

2. It is based upon apostolic authority; Acts 14: 22; 1 Tim. 4: 14; 2 Tim. 1: 6; 2: 2; 1 Tim. 3: 2; Rom. 15: 18; 1 Tim. 5: 21; Acts 20: 22; Col. 4: 17.

3. The mediate call inherits gracious promises: 1 Tim. 21: 16; 14; 2 Cor. 3: 6; Eph. 4: 12."

Seckendorf, (Christenstaat, III, XI, § 3):

"It is best that we take our stand upon the position which Christ has himself laid down, when he declared: Wheresoever two or three (to say nothing of a greater assembly) are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them, Matt. 18: 20; whence it follows that even such an assembly or congregation has of itself the power to order and appoint *everything needful for its divine worship*, at which Christ has promised to be present, &c."

Quenstedt, (Theol. did. pol. p. 1509):

"The originally efficacious cause of the ministerial office is God; the less directly constitutive source is the Church. The authority to select and call the ministers of the Word belongs, by divine right, not alone to the priests, or the ecclesiastical order, nor alone to the civil authority, nor alone to people at large, but to the whole Church; and without the consent and voice of the people there can be no legitimate call."

Brochmand, (Theol. Systm. II, p. 349):

"Our churches ascribe the right of choosing the ministers of the Word to the whole Church, and derive their authority from Acts 1: 22, 23. For, when an apostle was to be chosen in the place of the traitor Judas, Peter it is true, for the sake of order, introduced and presided over the transaction, but the whole Church elected two, between whom the lot was cast. If now the Apostles, who were extraordinarily called by Christ, and were endowed with special authority by God, did not presume of themselves to appoint the ministers of the Church, why do the Papal bishops, who are not worthy to be compared to the Apostles, as to their gifts, assume this right?"

Hulseman, (Vind. S. Script. p. 1224):

"The Church in its totality (*ecclesia collectiva*) can ordain suitable persons from among the laity that they may become clergymen."

Chemnitz, (Ded. I, 2. p. 419):

"The Church in any place is the whole body in which, under Christ as head, all the members of that place are comprised. Eph. 4; 1 Cor. 1. Therefore the call belongs neither to the ecclesiastics alone, nor to the mass of ordinary believers alone, for neither without the other is the *whole Church*; but the call belongs, and must ever belong, to the *whole Church*, and with due regard to order."

It is very surprising that any who claim to teach in accordance with the Confession can maintain the right of the Ministry alone to decide who are to be their successors in office!

Hear the following, for instance, from Löhe: (*Aphorismen über die neutestamentlichen Aemter*, &c., 1849, p. 71.)

"Everywhere in the New Testament we see that the holy office begets the Churches, never that the office is merely a transfer of congregational rights and plenary powers, that the churches confer the office. *The office stands in the midst of the Church like a fruitful tree that has its seed in itself.* As long as the examination and ordination remain in the hands of the Presbyterium (the *pastors*), it is right and can be maintained that it completes itself and propagates itself from person to person, from generation to generation. Those who hold it pass it along, and he, to whom its incumbents transfer it, holds it as from God. * * The office is a stream of blessing that pours itself from the apostles upon their disciples and from these onward into future times."

And again, page 86: "Observe how entirely different is the appointment of *deacons* (Acts 6) from that of *pastors*! In the case of the latter, the congregation is not called into consultation; it lies entirely in the hands of the appointing *apostles and evangelists*, who, at their discretion, and as occasion may require, take the advice of the congregation, or of individual members. On the other hand, at the appointment of the *diaconate* the whole congregation is called together, the plan is laid before it—although, it is true, in the form of a command, for the Apostles are the representatives of the Lord—and it gives and testifies its approbation. And now, how are the *deacons* chosen? According to a standard of qualification laid down by the Apostles they are elected by the congregation, then placed before the apostles and ordained by them. We may call the

Presbyterium a *sacred aristocracy* of the Church, whilst in the election of the deacons there lies something *democratic*."

Precisely the opposite of this was the special theme of Luther's "Sendschreiben wie man Kirchendiener wählen u. einsetzen soll, an den Rath u. Gemeine der Stadt Prag," 1523, viz.:

"*That Christians, as spiritual priests, possess all ecclesiastical authority.*" After enumerating all the priestly prerogatives of believers, he concludes thus: "We see here, clearer than the light of day and more surely than sure, whence we are to take the priests or ministers of the Word. Namely, we are to choose them out of the multitude of Christ's followers and from no where else. For, as it has been sufficiently demonstrated that every one has the right to serve in the Word, yes that this has been made the duty of every one when he sees that no one else is at hand, or that those who are at hand are teaching falsely, as Paul has shown, 1 Cor. 14: 27 sq., 'So that the praises of him that has called us may be shown forth by us all,' 1 Peter 2: 9—; *how much more should not then a whole congregation have the right and be under the obligation by means of a general election to commit this office to one or more in their stead?*" (Walch X, 1861.)

Nor are we to be told that this holds merely of the special call to a particular congregation, and not to the general call to the office; for Luther writes, in 1533, (Walch XIX, 1565):

"Where there is a holy Christian Church, there all the sacraments must be also, Christ himself and his Holy Spirit. If we then are a holy Christian Church and have those things that are of the *greatest and most essential importance*, God's Word, Christ, Spirit, faith, prayer, baptism, sacrament, *office of the keys, &c.*, shall we not also have *this smallest matter, namely, the power and right to call some TO THE OFFICE*, who are to minister to us the Word, baptism, &c., (which are already here) and to serve us in these matters—what kind of a church would that be?"

And, at an earlier date, 1520, (in his Letter to the German Nobility, Walch XIX, 202):

"Accordingly we are all by baptism consecrated as priests, as St. Peter says: (1 Peter 2: 9,) 'Ye are a royal priesthood and a holy nation,' and Rev. 5: 10, 'Thou hast made us unto our God kings and priests.' For, if there

were not a higher consecration in us than the Pope or the bishop gives, a priest could never be made by the consecration of Pope or bishop, though he might say masses, and preach and give absolution. Therefore the consecration of the bishop is nothing more than if he, in the place and on behalf of the whole assembly would take one out of the number of those, who all have the same authority, and enjoin it upon him to exercise this authority for the others. Just as if ten brothers, sons of a king, heirs alike, would choose one to manage the inheritance for them; they would all be kings and of equal authority, and yet one would be entrusted with the government. And, that I may state it still more clearly, if a little company of pious, Christian laymen were taken prisoners, and placed in a desert, and had not with them a priest consecrated by a bishop, and would agree to choose one of their own number, married or not, and entrust him with the office of baptizing, administering the communion, absolving and preaching, he would just as truly be a priest as if all the bishops and popes had consecrated him. Whence it follows, that in case of need every one can baptize and give absolution, which could not be the case if we were not priests."

The doctrine is stated, syllogistically, thus, by *Gerhard*, (Loc. Theol. de Min. Eccl. § 87):

"He who has received from Christ himself the keys of the kingdom of heaven, he has the right to call the servants of the Church. But these keys have been given to the whole Church. Therefore *the right to call the servants of the Church, belongs to the whole Church*. The major premise is proved by the definition of the keys; for by the keys we understand ecclesiastical authority, of which the right to choose the servants of the Church is a part. The minor premise is manifest from the words of Christ, Matt. 16: 19, where to Peter, representing the Church, it is said, I will give the keys of the kingdom of heaven."

Chemnitz, (Exam. II, loc. 18):

"And here the question arises, who those are by whose votes that election and call is to be decided, so that it may be regarded as divine, that is, that God himself by those means is choosing, calling and sending forth laborers into his harvest. Now we find certain and clear examples of this in the Scriptures. In Acts 1: 15, when a successor to Judas was to be appointed, Peter laid the matter not before the Apostles alone, but also before the rest of the

'disciples,' for so the 'believers were then called, whose number, there collected together, was one hundred and twenty. * * * When deacons were to be elected and called, Acts 6: 2 sq., the apostles do not assume the right of choosing, but they call the *congregation* together, &c. According to Acts 14: 28, Paul and Barnabas ordain presbyters in certain congregations, to whom they have preached the Gospel; but they do not assume for themselves alone the authority to choose and to call, but Luke uses here the word *zeipotomousantes*, which in 2 Cor. 8: 19, describes the election which is decided by the votes of the congregation, &c. * * * In the case of a legitimate call, in the days of the apostles, there were always two factors implicated and demanded, the consent of the congregation and the judgment and confirmation of the presbytery."

The Church does not relinquish (or dispossess herself of) her rights to the universal priesthood, when she appoints incumbents of the ministerial office, to perform its functions, in Christ's name, for her sake. No more than American citizens throw away their inalienable right of sovereignty by voting for an incumbent of the Presidential office. These rights and powers are inherent in them, in virtue of their citizenship, and are absolutely inalienable. Just so with the universal priesthood of believers.

It may be asked, however, does not the Church practically exercise this right of calling her servants when she does it *through those already in the holy office?* Is there not by common consent a general understanding upon this subject, to the effect that our churches, by retaining the right of giving the special call to a particular field of labor, hold in their hands a check upon the ministry; as though they were thereby continually saying to those who claim the right of examining and setting apart others to the holy office, be careful what kind of men you select and ordain, or we will refuse to call them to minister to us?

We reply: It has always been found to be a dangerous thing to suffer power to pass from the many to the few. We are neither more nor less human than those who have gone before us. And he has read the history of the Church to little purpose who has not observed how insidiously, almost imperceptibly, and yet how surely, from just such a small beginning as that, ecclesiastical encroachments have advanced, until, as Luther says: "They have established *an order* as though it were appointed by God, and

have taken such liberties that in the very midst of Christendom there is a greater difference than between us and the Turks." Unless tendencies toward centralization and monopoly are seasonably checked, history teaches that a revolution is needed to bring back the power and restore it to its true possessors. The world ought by this time to have learned the lesson, that it is best to leave the supreme authority where God intended it to be, viz.: in the masses of the people, and to have it peacefully and steadily administered by those whom the masses select and empower as their agents for that purpose. Such is the true theory of civil government, and such our Church understands to be the scriptural view of the Gospel Ministry.

At the same time it must be acknowledged that the practice of the Church has very generally varied from her theory in this matter. *Baier*, (in Schmid's *Dogmatik*, p. 479,) thus presents the case :

"The Church, after it is planted possesses the right and the power of appointing its ministers. For it holds for itself, as the bride, Christ's keys of the kingdom of heaven, given by the bridegroom, Matt. 16 : 18; 18 : 17, and thus, just as it belongs to her to open and shut the kingdom of heaven; so it is hers also to appoint the ministers through whom she opens and shuts. And thus, if we bear in mind that the Church is a kind of republic, and that the ministers of the Word are so to speak the magistrates or conductors of public affairs, upon whom the care of the whole republic rests, it is easily understood that the power of appointing them is vested, *per se* and in the very nature of the case, *in the whole Church*, nor does it belong to any one part unless, by the common consent of all it be transferred to some one part."

And *Hollazius*, (ibidem) :

"We must distinguish between the *right* of calling ministers and the *exercise* of the right. The right of calling belongs to the whole Church and all its ranks and members. But the exercise of the right varies according to the conventional custom of individual churches."

Our Church holds, moreover, that not only the *call* to the Ministry proceeds, under God, *from the whole Church*, by virtue of the universal priesthood and the power of the keys, but also that the *ordination* of those thus summoned to her service is nothing more than her official and public recognition of such call.

Melanchthon, Smalcald Articles, Append. 69, 70.:
 "These words (1 Peter 2 : 9, 'Ye are a royal priesthood,') refer particularly to the true Church, which, as it alone holds the priesthood, must also have the power of choosing and ordaining the servants of the Church. The usual custom of the Church also proves this; for anciently the people chose pastors and bishops; then the bishop of the same place, or living near by, confirmed the elected bishop by the imposition of hands; and in those days *ordination was nothing else than such confirmation.*"

Chemnitz, (Loc. de eccl. p. 126):

"Although ordination does not constitute the call, yet, if any one has been rightly called, then that custom is a declaration and a public attestation that the call that preceded it was lawful."

Baldwin, (De Casibus Consc. p. 1032-83):

"Ordination is nothing else than *the public and solemn confirmation of a legitimate call*, that all may know that this person has not taken violent possession of the ecclesiastical office, nor crept in otherwise, after the manner of thieves and robbers, but has entered by the true door. *

* Ordination is not indispensably and absolutely necessary, * *; for it is *neither divinely commanded*, so that it cannot be omitted, *nor is its influence so great*, as is pretended by the Papacy, so that it cannot be omitted without great danger; *nor does the efficacy of the office depend upon ordination*, as though the Gospel could not be savingly taught without it; but it is *an ecclesiastical custom* which recommends the servant of the Word and admonishes him of certain duties."

Gerhard, (XII, 146):

"We deny that ordination is necessary by reason of any such effects as the Papists ascribe to it, as though by it there were conveyed any indelible character, or as if it conferred, *ex opere operato*, gifts requisite to the ministry, concerning which no promise can be adduced from the sayings of Christ and the Apostles."

Gerhard, (Loc. Theol. de Min., § 154):

"As the right of *calling* belongs to the whole Church, so also *ordination*, which is the publication and attestation of the call, is performed in *the name of the Church*. The Presbytery performs the act of the laying on of hands but the Church unites with this her prayers. Although, therefore, for the sake of *legitimate good order*, it is proper that

the bishop at the same time with the Presbytery lays his hands upon the person to be ordained, yet he acts here not according to his own private will and in virtue of plenary power inhering in himself, but *in the name, through the right, by the vote, under the authority, with the consent, with the sanction, yes, with the prayers of the whole Church*; and thus the ceremony is performed by the bishop, but the act itself is the act of the Church, as we see from *Acts 6:8; 14:18*.

According to this statement, which exhibits the true theory of our Church upon this subject, the Ministry does not, by virtue of its official rank, &c., perpetuate itself, but is perpetually receiving its authority to examine, ordain, &c., fresh from the Church in which all ecclesiastical power is deposited.

In addition to the *calling* and *ordination* of her ministers, the Church, and indeed especially the *ordinary membership* of the Church, has also the duty imposed upon it of watching these her servants and *testing their soundness of doctrine*.

Augsburg Confession, Abuses Corrected, Art. XXVIII:

"The people and churches owe obedience to the bishops, according to the command of Christ, Luke 10:16, He that heareth you, heareth me. But if they appoint or establish anything contrary to the Gospel, we have the command of God in that case *not to obey them*, Matt. 7:15, Beware of false prophets; and, St. Paul, Gal. 1:18, If we, or an angel from heaven, &c., 2 Cor. 13:8, 10."

If it be objected that the laity, whilst having the right to judge of doctrines, &c., originally vested in them, cannot now exercise that right because it is now by common consent transferred to the ministerial office to be exercised through this for the benefit of the Church; we reply, that the Church has no liberty thus to divest herself of a right which is at the same time a duty, imposed upon all her members, not only inclusive of, but *as over against her ministering servants*. Ordinary believers are not only to share with those already in the ministry in calling others into the office, but they are to scrutinize the doctrinal soundness of their teachers and hold them to the law and testimony—to "try the spirits," whether they be of God—to search the Scriptures, to see whether their teachings are in accordance with the same, &c.

Luther, in 1522, (Ag. Henry VIII, Walch XIX, 424):

"To examine and decide upon doctrine belongs to any

and every Christian, and this so positively that he is cursed who interferes with it in the slightest degree. For Christ has established this right in many incontrovertible texts: *e. g.*, Beware of false prophets that come to you in sheep's clothing. This word he addresses, beyond a doubt, to the people, against the teachers, and commands the people to beware of their false doctrines. But how can they avoid them unless they know what they are? And how can they know this unless they have power to judge? Now he not only gives them power to judge, but he also commands them to exercise it. So that this single passage would be enough against all popes, fathers, councils, decisions of all schools, that have attributed the right of judging and deciding only to bishops and ecclesiastics, and have godlessly and sacrilegiously stolen it away from the people, that is to say the Church, the queen, &c."

Having thus endeavored to set forth the main topic of our Article, chiefly in the very words of the standard authorities, and with special reference to those features of it at present attracting public attention, we beg leave to express, in conclusion, both our gratification and regret in view of the relation sustained by the General Synod of our Church in this country, as we understand it, to the Confession and to the Scriptures, with reference to the doctrine of the Holy Ministry.

And first, *our gratification*, as we observe how closely our American Lutheran Church, of the General Synod, clings to the Scriptures and to the Confession in her views and practices in regard to this subject. Her official utterances, and the private publications of her most learned and influential representative men, distinctly echo, in the main, the confessional statements that have been spread before you, and also the spirit of the Confession upon other features of the office not specially adverted to, just as these reflect the teachings of the Word of God. We have reason to congratulate ourselves that those who, in the providence of God, gave shape to the theology and life of our Church in this country were principally men trained under the influence of an essentially orthodox Pietism, and that through them the revived spirituality of the German Lutheran Church passed over into and gave type to our American Lutheran Church life within the General Synod. That such was our origin, accounts for the fact that, in some respects, our church policy approaches more nearly

to the *ideal* of the Reformers and their immediate successors than that which our Church was compelled, by the force of unfavorable circumstances, to adopt upon her native soil. The Lutheran Church never had a completely fair opportunity of putting into practice her principles upon the subject of the Gospel Ministry until she found it in these western wilds, absolutely free from all state control and enjoying entire religious liberty. Thus disenthralled, our Church rejoiced in the opportunity of actualizing much that she had longed for in vain when fretting in the shackles of Erastianism. For all of this we feel devoutly thankful.

What occasion, then, have we for regret?

We entertain profound respect for the piety, the learning, and the wisdom of those who laid the foundations of our Church in this country, and of those who, in the same spirit, organized our General Synod. We owe them a lasting debt of gratitude for what they accomplished in the line of advance just indicated. But we cannot dismiss this subject without modestly and reluctantly expressing our heartfelt regret, in view of what we have long regarded and deplored as a stopping short of what they might and should have accomplished in this direction. We lament that they were not able entirely to free themselves from inherited prejudices and to carry out, with rigid consistency, the Scriptural doctrine of our Church upon the subject of the Gospel Ministry.

Unfortunately, in our opinion, several features were engrafted upon our system of ecclesiastical polity which mar its symmetry and detract from its otherwise perfectly scriptural character.

We refer particularly to three points, viz. :

1. The sealing up of the mouth of a regularly appointed delegate to the legislative assembly of the Church if his pastor happen not to be present;

2. To the exclusion of the entire mass of the representatives of the churches from all participation in certain kinds of ecclesiastical business; and

3. The practical exclusion of the laity from all share in the selection and setting apart of young men for the ministry.

We cannot but regard these features of our Church

government as violations of the scriptural rights of the laity to a full and equal share in all that pertains to the sound and healthful administration of ecclesiastical affairs, and our conviction that the present agitations and discussion of the elementary principles of scriptural truth upon this subject will lead to such a re-adjustment of the relations between our ministry and people, as to bring about a complete realization of the beautiful harmony between them, anticipated by the sagacity of the fathers in the Reformation period, but placed beyond their reach by the circumstances that surrounded them.

Already, indeed, has the *first* of these obnoxious features been removed from the constitutions of some of our Synods, and in these the representatives of the churches are now admitted to an equal share in that portion of the ecclesiastical legislation that is designated *Synodical*. There exists no longer that odious distinction between clergy and laity which seemed to imply that a layman would not know how to vote unless his pastor were there to direct him ; or, if this were not its purpose, then that cunning provision that so effectually placed the reins of government in the hands of the clergy, by making it absolutely impossible that there should ever be a preponderance of lay votes in the Synod.

And as to the *second* of these obnoxious features, the practice of some of our Synods has been somewhat modified, despite the spirit and letter of the constitution. In some of them the representatives of the churches are informed, at a certain stage of the proceedings, that they need not retire, as they formerly were requested to do, but can remain, if they choose, whilst the clergy attend to certain kinds of ministerial business. A move in the right direction, certainly ; and an indication, we hope, of something better. One more step, and that the essential one, of giving the lay delegates an equal voice with the ministry in *all ecclesiastical affairs*, and all will be right.

Such a change as that would include the correction of what appears to us to be the chief defect of all, viz.: the practical exclusion of the laity from all share in the selection and setting apart of young men for the Ministry. Some ten years ago our feeble voice was raised in behalf of a reform in this matter, advocating "*the right and the duty of the whole Church, through her representatives, clerical and lay, to take an active part in the discussion and decision*

of all questions effecting her welfare, and, among others, especially, also, in the great question as to WHO SHALL CONSTITUTE HER MINISTRY." According to our present Synodical constitution the laity are not allowed to take any part whatever in deciding this question. It is solely a prerogative of the clergy. And, apologize for this feature of our Church polity as we may, it in effect amounts to constituting the clergy a self perpetuating class, just the very abuse against which the Reformers so vehemently protested. Allow us simply to mention the grounds upon which our plea was based, whilst we refer those who may feel a special interest in the question, to our Article in the forty-seventh number of the Evangelical Review for the argument in detail.

The points are, that by such reform we would

"1. Bring back the Church in this particular into conformity with primitive Christian usage.

2. That we would practically and fully illustrate one of the fundamental principles of the Reformation, which in this feature of our Church government, is strangely ignored;

3. That we would hereby accord with our brethren of several other branches of the Protestant Church in acknowledging the true position of the laity in the regulation of ecclesiastical affairs;

4. That we would thereby avoid much unnecessary offence;

5. That we would furnish an additional guarantee for the preservation of sound doctrine and pure morals in the Church; and

6. That we would secure a more cordial interest in the Church on the part of the laity and stimulate their zeal in laboring for her welfare."

On all these points our convictions have only deepened with time, and we cannot conceal the gratification it has afforded us to find that the Board of Directors of the Theological Seminary of the General Synod, in selecting a person to prepare the Holman Lecture upon the Fifth Article of the Augsburg Confession, saw fit to fix their choice upon one who had so frankly and earnestly been pleading for a re-adjustment of the relations of the clergy and laity in our ecclesiastical jurisprudence. It is hardly to be supposed that this choice was made at random. If it was done with any reference to the fact that we have

adverted to, it may be hailed as an indication of progress in what we feel assured to be the right direction. If it was not done with any such design, it has at least afforded a favorable opportunity for the utterance, on the part of a true child of the Church, of long-cherished and ever-deepening convictions on a subject of momentous importance.

—————

NOTICES OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

An English-Greek Lexicon. By C. D. Yonge. With many new articles, an appendix of proper names, and Tilton's Greek Synonyms. [To which is prefixed an Essay on the order of words in Attic Greek Prose by Charles Short, LL. D., Professor of Latin in Columbia College, New York.] Edited by Henry Drisler, LL. D., Professor of Greek in Columbia College, Editor of "Liddell and Scott's Greek-English Lexicon," etc., etc. New York: Harper & Brothers.

A Comparative Grammar of the Anglo-Saxon Languages, in which its forms are illustrated by those of Sanskrit, Greek, Latin, Gothic, Old Saxon, Old Friesic, Old Norse, and Old High German. By Francis A. March, Professor of the English Language and Comparative Philology in Lafayette College. New York: Harper & Bros.

Prophecy a Preparation for Christ: Eight Lectures preached before the University of Oxford, in the year MDCCCLXIX, on the *Hampton Foundation*. By R. Payne Smith, D. D., Regius Professor of Divinity and Canon of Christ Church, Oxford. Boston: Gould & Lincoln.

The Seat of Empire. By Charles Carleton Coffin ("Carleton"). Boston: Fields, Osgood & Co

White as Snow. By Edward Garrett, author of "Occupation of a Retired Life," "Crust and Cake," and Ruth Garrett. New York: Anson D. F. Randolph & Co.

Summer Drift-wood for the Winter Fire. By Rose Porter. New York: Anson D. F. Randolph & Co.

The Juno Stories. Volume First. *Juno and Georgie*. Volume Second. *Mary Osborne*. By Jacob Abbott. New York: Dodd & Mead.

Olaf Thorlaksen. An Iceland Narrative by W. Oertel von Horn. From the German by Rev. Matthias Sheeleigh. Philadelphia: Lutheran Board of Publication.

American Edition of Dr. William Smith's Dictionary of the Bible. Revised and Edited by Prof. H. B. Hackett, D. D. With the co-operation of Ezra Abbott, LL. D. Parts XXIX and XXX. New York: Hurd & Houghton.

An Introduction to Latin Composition. By William F. Allen, A. M., Professor of Ancient Languages and History in the University of Wisconsin. Boston: Ginn Brothers & Company.

Tenth and Eleventh Reports of the Orphans' Home, Rochester, Beaver county, Pa., and the Orphans' Farm School, Zelienople, Butler county, Pa. 1868—1869.

IN MEMORIAM.

A melancholy interest attaches itself to the present number of the Review, for it goes forth without passing under the eye of him who for so many years found delight in superintending the issue of this journal, and whose graceful pen contributed so largely to its pages. That eye is closed in death—that hand rests from its toil.

At the end of the collegiate year Dr. Stoever left home, as was his custom, to seek recreation and rest amid his relations and friends elsewhere, and to attend to the general interests of the Review. Whilst apparently in ordinary health, he nevertheless remarked to several friends, before leaving home, that he felt more than usually worn down and weary, and was glad that the time for recreation had come.

On the following Sunday he partook of the Lord's Supper at Germantown, his native place, in company with his aged mother. Writing to his absent wife on the day following, he remarked—"This was a most precious season to my soul. It seemed to me that, if it were the Lord's will, I could just pass away to my heavenly home."

A jaunt along the Susquehanna, as far as Selinsgrove, for the two-fold object of business and pleasure, occupied him during the week following, and left him, upon his return to Philadelphia, in a greatly enfeebled condition. A fever supervening, he rapidly sank, and departed this life on the following Friday, July 22d, having just passed his fiftieth year.

Our object, in these few lines, is simply to make a formal record, in the closing number of the present volume of the Review, of the lamented decease of its Editor, and to express the hope that some sympathizing and willing hand

will ere long be found to indite a fitting memorial of one, a principal part of whose calling seemed to be to serve as an appreciative and conscientious necrologist in the midst of our Lutheran Zion.

What more appropriate tribute to his memory could we have than the publication of such a memorial in the opening number of a new series of the Evangelical Review? For we will not suffer ourselves to fear that this journal, which has been so ably conducted, for so many years, by our dear departed brother, is to expire with him. The wants of our Church clearly demand its continuance; and, whilst we are not now prepared to state under what auspices it shall hereafter be issued, we feel warranted in saying that the reasonable expectations of the Church in the matter shall not be disappointed.

C. A. H.

June 19, 1861
Lutheran Sentinel

INDEX TO VOL. XXI.

- Aids to Sermonizing, 568.
Alden's Science of Government, 485.
Allen's Latin Course, 484, 636.
Ambrose, Life and Times of, 234.
Among my Books, 316.
Andersen's Spain and Portugal, 484.
Anglo-Saxon Language, Grammar of, 636.
Annual of Scientific Discovery, 485.
Ascensions of Christ, 85.
Augsburg Confession, Article V., 599.
Baugher, Rev. Dr., Art. by, 250.
Baugher, Rev. H. L., Art. by, 128.
Bergstresser, Rev. P., Art. by, 377.
Bickersteth's Spirit of Life, 314.
Bingham's Latin Series, 485.
Bismarck, Life of, 481.
Bonar's Light and Truth, 314.
Borrows' Bible in Spain, 149.
Brooks' *Aeneid*, 318.
Brooks' Manual, 150.
Brooke's Sermons, 480.
Bullions' Latin Grammar, 485.
Burns, W. C., Memoir of, 481.
Chase and Stuart's Classics, 154.
Chemnicius *Redivivus*, 553.
Chemnitz and the Council of Trent, 398.
China and the Chinese, 316.
Chinese Problem, 77.
Choate, Life of, 481.
Christ in Song, 480.
Christ's Prophecy of his Sufferings, 128.
Christian Festivals, 316.
Civilizing Influences of Christianity, 525.
Close Communion, 111.
Completeness in Christ, 519.
Cultivation of the Religious Sensibility, 489.
D'Aubigne's History of the Reformation, 149.
Diehl, M., D. D., Reminiscences of, 177.
Divine Government, 377.
Draper's Civil War, 484.
Ecce Caelum, 312.
Eclipse of the Sun, of 1869, 134.
Empire, The Seat of, 636.
Exchange of Pulpits, 224.
Exposition of Luke 16 : 9, 191.
Fatherland Series, 483, 636.
Fergus Morton, 315.
Ferrier, Rev. E., Art. by, 210, 433.
Flavius Josephus, 415.
Fry, Rev. J., Art. by, 283.
Gates Ajar, 315.
God's Care of His Church, 157.
God's Thoughts, 313.
Gould's Songs of Gladness, 151.
Greatness of Being Useful, 64.
Greenwald's Questions on the Gospels, 486.
Guericke's Manual of Church History, 479.
Hagenbach's Church History, 148.
Hall's Health by Good Living, 318.
Hamilton, James, Life of, 481.
Hanna's Life of Christ, 314, 479.
Harkey, Rev. S. L., Art. by, 111.
Harkness' Series, 154, 486.
Harrington's *Plautus*, 317.
Hay, Rev. Dr., Art. by, 299, 321, 599.
Hay, W., Art. by, 535.
Haydn and other Poems, 485.
Haydn's Dictionary of Dates, 317.
Heck, J., Reminiscences of, 171.
Hedged In, 482.
Henderson's *Ezekiel*, 311.
Henkel, Rev. D. M., Art. by, 373.
Himes, Prof. C. F., Art. by, 134.
Hindoos, Eight Years among the, 443.
Hyacinthe's Discourses, 151.

Lutheran Quarterly

JUN 19 1938

- Idealism of Berkeley, 200.
 Immortality, 313.
 Jacobs, Rev. H. E., Art. by, 398, 553.
 Jones' Elements of the Hebrew Language, 479.
 Juno Stories, 636.
 Kingdom of Christ, 250.
 Kremer's Bible Gems, 315.
 Krummacher's Autobiography, 149.
 Kunkelman, Rev. J. A., Art. by, 77.
 Lamps, Pitchers and Trumpets, 313.
 Lange's Commentary, 311.
 Lange's Romans, 148.
 Lea's Studies in Church History, 315.
 Life and Times of Ambrose, 234.
 Life of J. Addison Alexander, D. D., 312.
 Lintner, Rev. Dr., Art. by, 9.
 Little Drops of Rain, 151.
 Loneliness of Hamlet, 210.
 Lord's Ancient States and Empires, 152.
 Lossing's Field Book of the War of 1812, 153.
 Loy, Prof. M., Art. by, 44.
 Luther at the Diet of Worms, 350.
 Luther on the Ministry, 182.
 Lytton's Horace, 317.
 Macgregor's Shepherd of Israel, 149.
 Man in Genesis and Geology, 312.
 Marriage, Christian Doctrine of, 482.
 Martin, Rev. A., Art. by, 182.
 Martyrs, Heroes and Bards of the Scottish Covenant, 150.
 Mathematical Dictionary, 153.
 McClintock and Strong's Encyclopedia, 479.
 McCosh's Laws of Discursive Thought, 485.
 McMillan, Rev. W., Art. by, 443.
 Meekness of Moses, 283.
 Memoir of Rt. Rev. G. Burgess, D. D., 312.
 Miller, G. B. D. D., Reminiscences of, 24.
 Mission Work in the Lutheran Church, 373.
 Munamsen's History of Rome, 152, 317.
 Murray's Sermons, 480.
 Music and Song of the Ages, 459.
 New Landers and German Redemptionists, 290.
 Notices of New Publications, 148, 311, 479, 636.
 Our Father's House, 482.
 Our Father in Heaven, 480.
 Our New Way round the World, 316.
 Outlines of New Testament History, 151.
 Pater Mundi, 313.
 Paul the Preacher, 150.
 Peters, Rev. G. N. H., Art. by, 85.
 Piety and Property, 44.
 Pollard's Life of Jefferson Davis, 153.
 Prophecy a Preparation for Christ, 636.
 Proverbs of all Nations, 153.
 Raub's Educational Talks, 154.
 Raymond and the N. Y. Press, 317.
 Reck, A., Reminiscences of, 339.
 Reminiscences of Deceased Lutheran Ministers, 24, 172, 334.
 Removing Mountains, 314.
 Revivals, Influence of, 9.
 Robertson, F. W., Life of, 480.
 Robertson's Sermons, 480.
 Robinson, Rev. Dr., Art. by, 459.
 Romance of Spanish History, 484.
 Rude, Rev. A. R., Art. by, 508.
 Scenes in the Life of Paul, 482.
 Schmid's Dogmatic Theology, 299, 321.
 Scudder, Rev. John, Memoir of, 481.
 Searing's *Aeneid*, 154.
 Seiss' Lectures on the Apocalypse, 150.
 Sermonizing, Aids to, 508.
 Settemyer, Rev. W. H., Art. by, 191.
 Shining Light, 150.
 Smith's Dictionary of the Bible, 318, 486, 636.
 Sorrow, 149.
 Stayman's Poems, 318.
 Stephan and the Stephanites, 255.
 Stephens' View of the Late War, 484.

- Stepping Heavenward, 313.
Stoever, Prof. M. L., Art. by, 24,
171, 234, 334, 405.
Stohlmeyer, C. F. E., D. D., Remin-
iscences of, 334.
Summer Driftwood, 636.
Taylor's Classical Study, 317.
Tennyson, 433.
Thornwell's Discourses on Truth,
149.
Tom Harding and his Friends, 151.
Tree of Life, 150.
Truth Made Plain, 315.
Unity in Essentials, 426.
Upham's Mental Philosophy, 152.
Valentine, Rev. Dr., Art. by, 64,
157, 519.
Veil Lifted, 152.
Waddell's Greek Grammar, 486.
Ware's Hints to Young Men, 316.
Warp and Woof, 485.
Webb, Rev. Dr., Art. by, 1.
Weddell, Rev. A. J., Art. by, 224.
Weiser, Rev. R., Art. by, 290.
Whateley's Essays on Religion,
311.
White as Snow, 636.
Williams' Notes on Matthew, 411.
Winslow's Titles of Christ, 150.
Words of Comfort, 314.
Works and Faith, 1.
Yonge's English-Greek Lexicon,
636.
Younan's Botany, 486.
Zimmerman, M. V., Art. by, 426.

CONTRIBUTORS TO THE REVIEW.

L. E. Albert, D. D.; S. A. Allibone, LL. D.; F. R. Anspach, D. D.;* Prof. F. Apel; Rev. B. Appleby; Rev. J. B. Baltzly, A. M.; H. L. Baugher, D. D.; Prof. H. Louis Baugher, A. M.; Prof. C. C. Baughman, A. M.; Prof. S. E. Becker, A. M.; Rev. P. Bergstresser, A. M.; Prof. A. T. Bievent; D. F. Bittle, D. D.; Rev. F. M. Bird, A. M.; J. B. Bittinger, D. D.; Rev. A. L. Bridgman, A. M.; J. A. Brown, D. D.; G. Burrowes, D. D.; J. G. Butler, D. D.; F. W. Conrad, D. D.; Prof. V. L. Conrad, A. M.; H. Coppee, LL. D.; G. Diehl, D. D.; H. S. Dickson, D. D.; Rev. J. R. Dimm, A. M.; Rev. H. L. Dox; J. T. Duffield, D. D.; Prof. C. J. Ehrehart, A. M.; L. Eichelberger, D. D.;* Rev. P. Eirich; Prof. A. Essick, A. M.; Rev. W. F. Eyster, A. M.; Prof. E. Ferrier, A. M.; S. D. Finckel, D. D.; Rev. H. A. Fink, A. M.; Rev. D. H. Foct, A. M.;* Rev. J. Fry; E. Greenwald, D. D.; W. H. Green, D. D.; Rev. J. B. Gross; H. Harbaugh, D. D.;* C. A. Hay, D. D.; Prof. S. L. Harkey; S. W. Harkey, D. D.; Rev. D. M. Henkel; Prof. L. W. Heydenreich; Prof. C. F. Himes, Ph. D.; Rev. J. Hinderer, A. M.; Rev. R. Hill, A. M.; Rev. S. A. Holman, A. M.; Rev. J. N. Hoffman, A. M.;* E. W. Hutter, D. D.; Rev. W. Hull, A. M.; M. Jacobs, D. D.; Rev. H. E. Jacobs, A. M.; Prof. E. J. Koons, A. M.; Rev. J. R. Keiser, A. M.; B. Kurtz, D. D., LL. D.;* G. F. Krotel, D. D.; C. Philip Krauth, D. D.;* C. Porterfield Krauth, D. D.; J. A. Kunkelman; Rev. Thomas Lape, A. M.; Rev. H. S. Lasar; Prof. J. J. Lehman; G. A. Lintner, D. D.; A. H. Lochman, D. D.; Prof. A. Loos; Prof. M. Loy, A. M.; James Macfarlane, A. M.; Hon. E. McPherson, LL. D.; Hon. D. McConaughy, A. M.; Prof. A. M. Mayer, Ph. D.; Hon. G. C. Maund, A. M.; W. J. Mann, D. D.; G. B. Miller, D. D.;* Prof. E. Miller, A. M.; H. Mills, D. D.; J. G. Morris, D. D.; L. Moss, D. D.; I. J. Mombert, D. D.; F. A. Muhlenberg, D. D.; Prof. A. Martin; J. W. Nevin, D. D.; Rev. G. B. Nixdorff, A. M.; Rev. M. Officer; Prof. S. A. Ort, A. M.; J. Oswald, D. D.; A. P. Peabody, D. D., LL. D.; Rev. J. K. Plitt, A. M.; H. N. Pohlman, D. D.; Rev. G. N. H. Peters; Rev. J. B. Rath, A. M.; W. M. Reynolds, D. D.; J. W. Richards, D. D.;* Rev. M. H. Richards, A. M.; Rev. P. Rizer, A. M.; T. H. Robinson, D. D.; B. Sadtler, D. D.; C. F. Schaeffer, D. D.; C. W. Schaeffer, D. D.; P. Schaff, D. D.; H. J. Schmidt, D. D.; S. S. Schmucker, i. D.; Rev. B. M. Schmucker, D. D.; W. H. Settemyer, A. M.; G. Seyfarth, D. D.; J. A. Seiss, D. D.; Rev. J. D. Seeringhaus, A. M.; J. L. Schock, D. D.;* Rev. M. Sheeleigh, A. M.; C. Short, LL. D.; J. Few Smith, D. D.; Rev. J. J. Smyth, A. M.; W. W.

* Deceased.

